

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After nine minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 16, 1911, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15, 1911.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Robert W. Kemp, of Missoula, Mont., to be receiver of public moneys at Missoula, Mont., vice William H. Houston, resigned.

POSTMASTER.

INDIANA.

Elmer W. Rust to be postmaster at Winslow, Ind. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15, 1911.

CAPTAIN COMMANDANT, REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Ellsworth P. Bertholf to be captain commandant, Revenue-Cutter Service.

SURVEYOR GENERAL OF MONTANA.

Jerome G. Locke to be surveyor general of Montana.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Robert W. Kemp, receiver, Missoula, Mont.

POSTMASTERS.

GEORGIA.

Pet L. Cooke, Doerun.
Abbie B. Youmans, Adrian.

ILLINOIS.

William S. Jenkins, Golconda.

INDIANA.

Claude B. Thomas, Moores Hill.

KENTUCKY.

Thomas M. Scott, Somerset.

MISSOURI.

T. C. Pinkley, Portageville.

OHIO.

Leroy C. Benedict, Mansfield.

TENNESSEE.

Alvin J. Roller, Bristol.

H. Filmour Shoun, Greeneville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, June 15, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Great Spirit, Father, Soul, everywhere present, a potent influence in the affairs of men, we wait upon Thee with open minds and hearts, that the issues of this day may be in consonance with Thy holy will, in the Spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, there is a vacancy on the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, caused by the resignation of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. I desire to move the election of Mr. OSCAR CALLAWAY, of Texas, to fill that vacancy.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves the election of Mr. CALLAWAY to fill the vacancy existing on the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department. Are there any other nominations?

There were no further nominations, and the motion of Mr. UNDERWOOD was agreed to.

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a privileged motion. I move that the Committee on Expenditures

in the Interior Department be discharged from the further consideration of House resolution 105.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida sends to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution, and moves that the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department be discharged from its further consideration. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, requested to furnish the House with copies of all complaints, allegations, and charges of every character filed in his office touching the management of the Government Hospital for the Insane within the past two years, as well as copies of any report as to conditions at such hospital made by any person or persons under the direction of the Interior Department, or any other authority on file in said department.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida moves that the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department be discharged from further consideration of this resolution. It becomes privileged by the fact that the committee has not reported within the seven days required by the rule.

Mr. MANN. When was the resolution introduced?

The SPEAKER. On April 18.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I understood that the caucus had suspended the rule.

The SPEAKER. A caucus can not suspend a rule of the House. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution which has been reported by the Clerk.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the resolution is now before the House, and I desire recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for one hour.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman how much time he will occupy.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is more than I can tell.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. The reason I ask is that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] would like to have a few minutes to make some statements in regard to the resolution.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I want to see if we can not adjust the matter about a division of time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not care to take up much time. How much time does the gentleman from Illinois want?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Twenty minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will give the gentleman 20 minutes, but I want the conclusion.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Well, that is all right.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Oh, no; the gentleman from Florida wants 20 minutes, and then at the conclusion of my remarks 20 minutes more.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will give the gentleman 30 minutes, and then I will take 10 minutes in conclusion.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would rather the gentleman from Florida would go ahead and occupy what time he expects to now and be through with it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced, as it appears on its face, on the 18th of April of this year. I shall undertake not to weary the House. I shall not, I trust, trespass too much upon its time, but this is a question in which I feel the very deepest of interest. It involves a matter that ought to appeal to the conscience of every Member of this House, no matter what his political affiliations may be, and on account of my knowledge of some affairs in connection with it I have felt that in the interest of economic administration of government and in the interest of humanity this institution must be thoroughly investigated and such remedies applied as will correct the existing evils. I offered this resolution for the purpose of ascertaining facts from the department having this bureau under its control, but the committee has not seen fit to consider it. The department has made no effort to answer. I do not blame the department, because it probably has not been called to the attention of those in charge; and, in order that the House may fully understand, I desire to say that I offered another resolution on this same subject, seeking an investigation of this institution, which went to the Committee on Rules of this House, and has been there for some little time. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, what rules govern the Committee on Rules. I do know, and it struck me as a rather queer proceeding, that in this case the persons to be investigated were sent for. They were heard on the question as to whether or not they ought to be investigated. Now, an investigation of the Steel Trust has been ordered at the instance of the Committee on Rules. I do not object to that; I think it ought to be investigated. But I do not understand that Mr. Morgan or any

of the gentlemen controlling that trust were sent for by the Committee on Rules to be interrogated with reference to their desires as to being investigated. The Sugar Trust is also to be investigated. I do not know that Mr. Atkins, the acting president—if that is his name—or any other person interested in the Sugar Trust was sent for and interrogated as to the desirability of their being investigated.

There is also a resolution here, reported from that committee and acted on by the House, to investigate certain affairs of the District of Columbia—the corporations, tax assessments, and so forth. I do not understand that the Commissioners of the District and the officials of the street railway companies were sent for and their wishes with reference to their being investigated ascertained; but in this particular case, a case, Mr. Speaker, which involves in it questions reaching higher than any question of dollars and cents, which has for its object the ascertainment of the treatment of about 3,000 human beings, black, white, male and female, old and young, who unfortunately have become bereft of their reason, the officials in whose charge these unfortunates are, who are sought to be investigated, are sent for by the Committee on Rules. This is a resolution which ought to appeal, as I said in the beginning, to every man on this floor, no matter what his business in life or his political affiliations may be, and I want to say here, Mr. Speaker, in the Fifty-ninth Congress, a Republican House, a Republican Committee on Rules, upon a resolution offered by me, ordered an investigation of this institution. The report came in the House so late in the last days of the dying Congress that absolutely nothing could be done, and I hold in my hand now the testimony taken by that investigating committee, covering about 2,000 pages, at a cost to the Government of about \$30,000, I am told—all wasted, all gone, every dollar of it expended, and nothing accomplished, except one thing. It did appear on this investigation that the superintendent of that asylum was his own disbursing officer, expending more than a million dollars a year, with practically no check upon the manner of its expenditure. That looked a little too tough, so we find in an appropriation following a little later a provision that there should be a disbursing officer at the Government Hospital for the Insane, coupled with the condition that the superintendent should appoint him and that he should be under the supervision of the superintendent. The superintendent appointed a young man who occupied some sort of a confidential relation to him, whose salary at that time was \$1,500, and he put his salary at \$2,500 a year. So the net result of the expenditure of \$30,000 in this investigation is the raising of the salary of one man \$1,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, my resolution now before the Rules Committee recited the facts of this former investigation, called attention to the fact that the reports were made too late for action, and simply asked that a new committee should be appointed with power to take such small additional testimony as in their judgment was proper, and report that in connection with this testimony to this House and let it be acted upon. I have stated to members of the Rules Committee—I do not know but what I stated it to the entire committee—that the additional cost would not exceed \$500, and I was perfectly willing, and am now, that the expenditure should be limited to \$500. Yet, Mr. Speaker, here is a resolution involving the happiness, if such a thing can come to people so afflicted; involving the comfort; yea, in some instances involving the lives, of some of these 3,000 people, and the Rules Committee can not afford to spend \$500 to ascertain the relief that is needed, and give the House an opportunity to extend that relief.

And yet they go down into the Treasury of the United States for \$25,000 on a fishing expedition against the Sugar Trust. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what measure of proof these gentlemen require. I was told by one Member that I ought to submit proof sufficient that if it was a criminal charge it would warrant a grand jury in returning an indictment. Now, I do not know much about the law—never pretended to. I have had a license to practice, and have been hanging around courthouses for about 30 years, and have absorbed some little information along those lines by contact with other lawyers. I do not profess to be in a class with the gentlemen who compose the Rules Committee, and particularly the gentleman who gave me that valuable information; but, Mr. Speaker, I have heard somewhere, I have heard it intimated, and I have absorbed it, and it has been with me for a good long number of years. I may be wrong, but I have heard of a proposition something like this: I have been told it is good law that when a condition is once shown to exist, that condition is presumed to continue until the contrary is made to appear by competent proof.

I put all of this testimony before the Rules Committee, showing, Mr. Speaker, here almost under the Dome of this Capitol, a most disgraceful condition of affairs, and one which I dare say does not exist in any like institution anywhere in this country. I have said, and I say now, that the record in this case, as drawn out in this testimony, is one long trail of cruel mistreatment of these unfortunate people. Murders have been committed over there, escapes are frequent, any quantity of witnesses testified to the bad condition of the food, and other things of that kind, and yet our friends—I agree with them you know; I am in this economy business myself now; I never have been much of an economist, do not claim to be, but I remember, and you all remember, that our distinguished Speaker, for whom I entertain the very highest regard, and I think he did what was proper, I know he did from his viewpoint; I do not know if I would have done it, I am not so good a man as my friend; but he declined to use an automobile at Government expense because he said it was no part of the duty of the Government to furnish it to him. Here is a little subordinate officer over there, a bachelor, with eight or nine rooms for his personal use, although it is very crowded in this institution, there being a scarcity of room, and they say they can not take care of the inmates but need more buildings and rooms—here is this man with eight or nine rooms in his own private apartment, with a special cook for himself individually, and a servant in his apartment, besides the coachman and chauffeur—I believe that is what he is called—and he has two automobiles, a carriage, and a pair of horses, and the electric cars run right by his door to all parts of the city. And this is all furnished at the expense of the Government, in addition to his salary. Now, that is economy with a vengeance. Here is the next highest officer of the Government—I think in point of dignity the Speakership is next to the Presidency—and if any officer of this Government ought to be furnished with a conveyance to go about over the city befitting the dignity of his place it is the Speaker, but he has none; and here is this little subaltern over there, who is an absolute dictator, and who exercises—and I assert this without fear of any sort of contradiction—this record shows that this man, with the power given him under the law and the rules of the Interior Department, is the greatest autocrat in America to-day. He has no boss, he goes and comes as he pleases, has all of these conveyances at the expense of the taxpayers of this country, and yet my friends, who are extremely economical, think that this ought to continue, I presume.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question; yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the management of this institution come under the District Commissioners in any form?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They are in no way responsible for the things charged by the gentleman?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not in the slightest. The institution was originally established, I will say to my friend and for the benefit of the House—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Pardon me, just one more question—then the government of this institution is wholly with the Department of the Interior?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Absolutely.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I understand the District sends patients to the institution.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am going to explain that; yes. The institution was originally established as a hospital for the insane of the Army and Navy. In the course of time the statute was amended by which the indigent insane of the District were admitted, and finally the criminal insane of the whole country.

That is to say, persons arraigned in Federal courts who are found to be insane are sent there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this record shows other things. It shows that the criminal insane are permitted to mingle with the innocent insane, and all authorities agree that this should not be allowed. They have over there about 1,000 acres of land. They conduct some quite extensive farming operations, and this man is the farmer, he is the doctor, he is the business manager, he is just as much the disbursing officer to-day as he ever was. He can discharge his disbursing officer in two minutes if he wishes to do so, and he will do it, of course, whenever the fellow does not do what he wants him to do.

Now, I say the old case showed by numbers of witnesses—and I have them all collated, but I shall not take up the time of the House to read it—numberless instances of cruel and inhuman treatment. It shows numerous instances of bad and

unfit food given to those people. It shows that the management is loose and careless on account of the great number of escapes. Another thing, too, this committee had superintendents of State asylums all over the country—and the record shows that Congress appropriates \$220 per capita per annum; when you add to that the pension money which they get from the old soldiers incarcerated there, the per capita cost goes up to about \$300 per annum. There is not another institution in America where there is anything approaching that cost per capita; and I assert, Mr. Speaker, that a proper investigation of this institution by a committee that meant to investigate, that meant to go to the bottom of it in good faith in order to relieve these people, would save this Government from \$200,000 to \$250,000 per annum. And then these patients would be better treated than they are to-day.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE]?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; for a question.

Mr. PAGE. The supervision of the expenditures of this institution being under the Interior Department, is not this matter within the province of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The question as to the financial end of it, I think, would be; but that is only one question.

Mr. PAGE. At the moment I interjected the question the gentleman was speaking of the financial end of the proposition and the financial affairs of the institution, and I want to say that I am in sympathy with the gentleman as to what he was saying as to the expenses and the enormous expenditure per patient.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes, sir.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I did not understand just what the gentleman meant by his reference to the fact that some old soldiers over there were drawing pensions and that that was counted in the cost of maintenance.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will explain that. By the way, I want to call attention to another fact just a moment. As I said in the beginning, I do not profess to know a great deal about law, but these old soldiers are sent to that institution usually from the soldiers' homes over the country. For instance, if the governor of a soldiers' home, or a subordinate of his, happens to fall out with the old fellow, if he is guilty of some infraction of some minor rule of the institution, and they want to get rid of him, he simply writes out a certificate and the soldier is committed to St. Elizabeth's Hospital for the Insane. There is no trial by jury, no trial by a court; he never has his day in court. Now, in the soldiers' home, as I understand it, the pension money goes to the individual for the benefit of the particular pensioner, but when he comes here, under what I consider to be a strained construction of the law, they take five-sixths of his pension money and cover it into the general fund of the institution. So you have the money which a beneficent Government has seen fit to give to these old soldiers going into a fund to take care of the criminal insane, the indigent insane, and other people, with whom he has no connection, thereby depriving him of some of the little comforts which the Government intended he should get out of this money.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Is that five-sixths of his pay intended to pay the expenses of the soldier in the hospital?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is deducted to pay his expenses in connection with those of nearly 3,000 other people. He gets one-sixth of his pension. The other five-sixths is put into the general fund and expended for the benefit of all.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Do I understand the gentleman discriminates between the criminal insane and those sent to the Government Hospital for the Insane from the soldiers' homes throughout the country? I understood the gentleman to speak specially of the criminal insane.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I did not catch the gentleman's question.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I wish the gentleman would explain what he means when he said "criminal insane," and

whether he means the criminal insane as distinguished from those who are sent to the institution from the soldiers' homes throughout the country.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. When I say "insane criminal" and "criminal insane," I use the terms interchangeably, although there is a distinction. I mean by "criminal insane" people who have been arraigned in court or indicted for a criminal offense who plead insanity and are supposed to be insane. They therefore can not be tried in a civil court on the criminal charge, and they are committed to this place because of their insanity.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Then the gentleman had reference entirely to the criminal insane, and he does not mean that men were taken from the soldiers' homes under certificate of the superintendent?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, no; not at all. These criminal insane come from the courts throughout the country, whereas the old soldiers come from the soldiers' homes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. The gentleman says that they are sent there under certificate of the superintendents of the soldiers' homes and that the superintendents have sole and absolute authority to commit them, and that there is no other provision for sending persons in the national soldiers' homes to the Government Hospital for the Insane.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is all.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I understand you to say that five-sixths of the pension money goes into the common fund?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Does that apply to a man with a family?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It applies to all of them.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. It makes no difference whether he has a wife and family or not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; they take that money; and if any is left, then they divide it with the family.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like the gentleman to explain that.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I wish to ask a question in connection with the reply to the gentleman from South Dakota. Is it not the practice throughout the United States in the soldiers' homes to take a part of their pensions, and does not that apply to these insane soldiers when they are committed as indigent patients?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I think so; but that is when a man has not got a family. When he has a family, a certain portion of it goes to his family. I am not making any assertion, though; I am simply trying to get information.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I did not hear what the gentleman from New Jersey said.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I am calling the attention of the gentleman from South Dakota to the fact that it was a common practice throughout the country to take some part of the pensions of the old soldiers when they are committed as insane patients to the Government institution.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The law provides that—

And such pension shall be by said superintendent disbursed and used under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of the pensioner, and in case of a male pensioner, his wife, minor children, and dependent parents, or if a female pensioner, her minor children, if any, in the order named, and to pay his or her board and maintenance in the hospital; the remainder of such pension money, if any, to be placed to the credit of the pensioner, and to be paid to the pensioner or the guardian of the pensioner in the event of his or her discharge from the hospital; or, in the event of the death of said pensioner, while an inmate of said hospital, shall, if a female pensioner, be paid to her minor children, and in the case of a male pensioner be paid to his wife, if living; if no wife survive him, then to his minor children; in case there is no wife or minor children, then the said unexpended balance to his or her credit shall be applied to the general uses of said hospital.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. To the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to ask the gentleman if the statute that he has just read does not apply to the pension that may be due to a soldier—that has accumulated—to the soldier who has no direct heirs, and that that sum is the money that goes into the general fund, and not the pension as it comes in regularly each quarter?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No, sir; it applies to every cent that he gets while an inmate of that institution, whether it is back pay or current pay.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I would like to say to the gentleman that I happen to be familiar with the case of a soldier who was in one of the national sanitariums, and he had an accumulation of several hundred dollars—I think it amounted to \$1,500 or \$2,000—and the man had been incompetent for some time before his death, and the brother of this soldier, upon his death, attempted to get that money, and he went up against this law which the gentleman has just read. It was claimed that under that law that money went into the regular fund of that institution, and that the heirs could not get it; that the money was there to the credit of the institution, and if the soldier had lived and left the institution he might have taken it away with him.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That was not in this asylum?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. It was in a national sanitarium.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am stating, Mr. Speaker, what is the fact with reference to St. Elizabeth's Asylum. It does not make any difference what the law or the theory may be. The fact is here admitted by the superintendent, and is not denied by anybody, that he takes five-sixths of every dollar from every old soldier who comes into that institution, and he puts it into the general fund.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman cite us that record that he says is in evidence?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Surely. The gentleman can get it in the document room, the testimony taken by the Olcott committee.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman a moment ago made a statement which to me is a most astounding one. I want the gentleman to put into the RECORD the statute which authorizes the governor of an old soldiers' home, by a mere certificate of his, without an examination, to send an old soldier to the insane asylum. If I understood the gentleman, it was that upon the mere certificate of the governor of an old soldiers' home—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. One of the inmates of that home could be transferred to St. Elizabeth's?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. I say if the law is as the gentleman has construed it, it ought to be amended.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Because no old soldier in any home ought to be absolutely at the mercy of the governor, and be placed in an insane asylum on the governor's certificate alone.

Mr. COX of Ohio. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will yield in a moment. I do not want to be misunderstood. I say that in these soldiers' homes there is no jury trial, there is no court investigation, there is nothing except what the authorities of the home themselves see fit to make, and the old soldier is sent to St. Elizabeth's upon the certificate of the governor of the home, and that is all.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have promised to yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX of Ohio. I want to state this case, because I think it is in point and should become a part of the record. A few days ago an old gentleman who had been an inmate of the Hampton Home came to me and stated his case, and I made inquiry of the St. Elizabeth's institution itself and had the claims which were made to me by this man verified. The facts were these: The soldier was committed to the institution here upon the statement of the governor of the Hampton Home that he was insane. He was kept out there two or three months—I think from last February until a few weeks ago. At the expiration of this time the surgeon there certified that the soldier was not then insane, and was not insane, apparently, when he was brought into the institution. Regardless of these facts and that situation, five-sixths of his pension money was still retained by the institution, and they have declined to give it up upon my request.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I must go on, because there are several things I want to say which I have not the time to say.

In addition to this record here, which any gentleman can get and examine if he is sufficiently interested to read it, in addition to this testimony there has been testimony taken by the present Rules Committee. As I say, I filed before that committee this record, under the theory that a condition once shown to exist is presumed to continue until the contrary appears. The contrary has not appeared, and I insist that the conditions are as bad there to-day as they were at the time this testimony was taken. But, in addition to that, I filed with the committee affidavits of people, some attendants, some who had been inmates, some who were not connected with the institution at all, showing absolutely that this cruel treatment continues and that the bad food conditions continue.

Now, here is a letter written to me. I never saw the man in my life. It is written in a hand like copperplate. He uses as good language as anyone you meet. He writes an infinitely better letter than I can, and probably better than some other gentlemen of my acquaintance. I want to read what he says. The law requires this superintendent to devote all his time to that institution, and yet he admits that he is all over the country, delivering lectures here and there. If you will take this record and go through it carefully, every time, almost without exception, where it appears that some disorder took place or some one escaped or something of that kind occurred, Dr. White was absent from the institution. Now, this letter was written June 2 of this year. Listen:

In reading the daily papers I notice that the superintendent of the hospital and also the visiting committee are handling the truth very recklessly—

I will not give this man's name; he is a patient; but the committee has seen it. I do not want to get the poor devil into any more trouble than he is in now—

If I could see you or your secretary privately I think myself and a few others could tell you a few things in regard to the mismanagement of this institution. As it is, I will say this: In the past two years and four months the visiting committee has been seen in the Howard Hall building just once.

"Two years and four months." Howard Hall is where the insane criminals are kept. Now, mind you, gentlemen, before the Committee on Rules appeared members of this Board of Visitors, as they did before the Olcott committee, this eminently respectable Board of Visitors, nice old gentlemen and old ladies—I will not say "old" ladies, for they never grow old—nice old gentlemen of distinguished appearance, eminently respectable as this Board of Visitors is, and they say, "Why, everything over there is as nice as pie. It is perfectly elegant." One of them said that the management of this man was "simply marvelous." They go over there once at month, at stated periods, when everything is fixed for the occasion, and I suppose the superintendent gives them a good dinner and may be some other things—I do not know—and then they come back delighted with the institution. Here is this man, who says that during two years and four months he has been there this Board of Visitors has not been in Howard Hall building but once.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is this letter from an inmate?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He was committed there as an insane man?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; and that is what these fellows say whenever you find a man in charge of insane people and anything occurs that does not look right, he smiles and says, "Oh, you know he is crazy, he is not responsible." I have had a little observation of that thing before.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Florida is reading and discussing the statement contained in this letter in which it says that the board of visitors was seen in Howard hall once in two years and four months.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. For my own information I would be glad if the gentleman would inform the House as to what opportunities this man would have to give any reliable information as to the number and character of the visits made by the board of visitors.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. This man is in Howard hall, and he would know if the board of visitors came there.

Mr. FITZGERALD. He might or he might not. This man is a criminal inmate, is he not?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; but the idea that a board of visitors, whose business it is to visit and inspect, can go into a place of that kind without this inmate seeing them is absurd. Here is an intelligent man who has not seen them but once in two years and four months. That was February 2, 1909. He further says:

Dr. White visited the same building four times.

Here is the superintendent in two years and four months visiting Howard Hall, the criminal insane ward, that he ought to visit more often than any other—visiting this Howard Hall four times in two years and four months. He gives the dates.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. For a question.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is that statement borne out by the testimony of anybody else?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman read that evidence?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not take the time; it is in this record. It is borne out by other witnesses that Dr. White visits there very irregularly, and some of them say not at all.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Just for a question, and then this is going to end it, because I must hurry.

Mr. KOPP. Does the gentleman think it is quite fair to Dr. White to criticize him in this way for not visiting this ward, based upon that letter, when it is a well-known fact by all those who have examined the question that many of the criminal insane are kept in the cells a great part of the time, and usually they are the class who are clever enough to write a letter of that kind?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Do I think it is fair to do what?

Mr. KOPP. To criticize Dr. White, basing the criticism upon a letter from an inmate who may be one of the vicious insane and confined to his cell?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, of course; if a man is unfortunately crazy on some subject, they have a right to treat him as they please, and he ought not to complain, and his word is not worth anything. The poor devil is there under the charge of a crime, we will say; and I want to say that better men than this record shows Dr. White to be have been charged with crime.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have not the time now, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry; but I want to finish. The letter continues:

February 2 he came with the committee. There were three individuals besides himself. February 21, 1910, August 25, 1910, he came to ward 5, when we were about to go in to their so-called dinner, solely to see Willard, the man who shot Beck; and March 20, 1911, he passed through two wards. What his object was I failed to find out.

Hoping that these few lines will reach you, for I am sending them over the doctor's head, and he came very nearly placing me in my grave about six months ago for trying to reach Congress; and I would write more, but there is a fear within my heart that it may miscarry. Will you be so kind as to please ask Representative _____, from my district, if he received a letter from me asking him to call here? Will you please be kind enough to let me know if you receive this letter, and what Mr. _____ said? Please forgive me for trespassing on your time—

And so forth.

Mr. Speaker, of course that is worth nothing, and none of the testimony of any of these inmates is worth anything, when put against the testimony of a man charged here with permitting occurrences at that institution which, if they are true, are worse than a crime.

Mr. Speaker, I assert that no man, I do not care what he is convicted of, I do not care what crime he commits—no jailbird, no convict with stripes on him—is half so mean, is half so low, is half so contemptible as is the man who will mistreat helpless, insane people in his care and keeping. [Applause.] There are numbers of other such letters here. Here is one that I will not read, because the language in it I would not care to read, but it tells of conditions that are simply fearful, repulsive, shocking to the sense of decency of any man. That thing and those things are allowed over there. Mr. Speaker, you will come nearer getting the truth, as a general rule, from children, fools, and crazy people than you will from your sleek, interested, designing gentlemen. How can you ever make proof unless you use this class of people? I assert that the record taken here before the old committee and before this committee showed that this Board of Visitors were absolutely incompetent to speak upon this subject. They had not been there enough; they had not had the opportunity to know the facts with reference to this management.

I will tell another thing that this record shows, and there is no evidence that that has ceased, either. There is a firm of lawyers in the city of Washington who are employed by Dr. White, and I will tell you what the court record shows in one case, and I am informed that there are plenty of others just like it. Some old soldier was put in there and he had \$226 of back pension money due him. The superintendent wanted it in the

hospital, of course, so he gets one of these lawyers to file a petition in his name, praying for the appointment of a committee in lunacy to take charge of the poor devil's estate. The other lawyer partner is appointed the committee in lunacy. The attorney who filed the petition got \$25, the committee in lunacy got \$25, two of the doctors of the institution got \$10 apiece in addition to their salaries, and, with the court costs and other charges, it cost that poor devil eighty-odd dollars to collect the \$226 due him by a beneficent Government; and that sort of thing continues to this day.

Now, Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, personally, I care nothing about this. It is true I have some constituents in there, and I have letters from their relatives, but I am interested in this question, and I am interested upon the broad lines of humanity, but I want to say to you, and I want to say to this House, how can we go home, you particularly who represent large constituencies of these soldiers, how can you go home to your people with the record staring you and them in the face showing that these people are systematically robbed of their little pittance, that they are forced to associate with the lowest class of criminals who go to that institution? Why, the superintendent says that none of the insane criminals are intermingled with the others; but I examined him, and upon cross-examination I made him admit that a certain physician, I will not call any names, indicted in the courts of Washington for the heinous crime of infanticide, plead insanity, was sent to St. Elizabeth's, and at the time this testimony was taken, he was not only an inmate of Maple ward, where the officers of the Army and Navy are kept, but he was absolutely on the pay roll of the institution drawing a salary every month. There is the record. That man—it makes no difference if he was a professional man and an educated man—is just as much a criminal as the vilest, lowest, meanest, sneak thief in that institution. [Applause.] Ah, Mr. Speaker, I say that you can talk about saving dollars for the people, you can talk about the probing of this department and the other, here is one that ought to appeal to the conscience of every man of this House who has a heart in him. This man is an absolute monarch over there, and these old soldiers who are sent there from all over this country are treated as I have told you the record here shows they are treated. Now, as I said a moment ago, I do not happen to come from a section where many of this class of people who are incarcerated here come from, but, Mr. Speaker, I am an American citizen. That flag is mine, and I always cheerfully vote to pay a pension to the old soldiers of my country. [Applause.]

And, as I said to a gentleman last night, I will vote for the enactment of any pension bill that my friends from the North bring in here and say their people want. [Applause.] But here are these people. They have spent their lives in the service of their country, spent it upon a pittance. God knows they get nothing for active service; and in their old days, when the sun of life is sinking beyond the hills and these old soldiers, crippled, wounded, and tottering on to the grave, bereft of reason, God help them when they fall into that institution with this record under the sworn testimony in the case. Is that the treatment that a just Government ought to accord to those people? I am appealing to you people who come from among them. Gentlemen talk on that side about the old soldier. Now, I am not making this talk for any votes that may come to me. There are not enough, although we have got quite considerable and they are growing more numerous with us every year, but there are not enough in my district to seriously affect me, if I do not get them. Thank God, I do get them, and they are my friends and I am theirs, but you people who may be dependent upon that vote for your seats in this House, I ask you, Do you think that is just and righteous treatment to be accorded them? Oh, I see some gentlemen smile who live in that section, but they get those votes. Mr. Speaker, my conduct in this House and my vote in this House shall never be measured solely upon the line of saving dollars to the people. I shall vote at all times, so far as I am able, guided and directed by my conscience as to what is right. This record shows that this is wrong. I know that some members of the committee have been there and looked the ground over at the instance and invitation of the superintendent. I do not object to that; it is a good thing to do—

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Will the gentleman permit an interruption right there?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have only about five minutes remaining.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Will the gentleman mention the names of this committee who have been invited there by the superintendent?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. So I understand—

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. If the gentleman understands it, then mention the names of those who have been invited there by the—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am not animadverting upon them for going—I understand the gentleman did—

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Do you mean to say I was invited by the superintendent?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not; no. I do not know whether you were or not. And it is perfectly immaterial.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. But you made the statement that they had been invited to visit by the superintendent of the institution?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would not confine myself strictly to that statement.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I think you ought not to do it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I say not, and I am not animadverting upon the gentleman or anybody else for going, but I say that the superintendent and others said that you could not investigate under three days, and that, in my judgment, would be a cursory investigation. I am not censuring the gentleman or anybody else for going there. They ought to go. Every Member of this House should go, and go at a time when not expected to be there.

Now, I say, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. NYE. Just one question.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. NYE. Did the Olcott committee draw any conclusions from the testimony and make any recommendation?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; they made quite a number of recommendations. A majority of the committee as a whole approved of the situation there. But still they recommended certain changes, and so on. The minority of the committee did not approve of it, and they pointed out some other things which they said were wrong, and so on. But—

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit just one question?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. How much time have I left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Four minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield for just a question.

Mr. KOPP. Other than the charge of misappropriation of pension money, which is clearly before the House, will the gentleman state in a few words just what the injustices are that are being suffered by the old soldiers—that he thinks should be investigated?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have been trying to do so. I certainly have been very unfortunate if I have not made myself understood on that point. I have not a very extensive vocabulary—

Mr. KOPP. I ask in all sincerity. I understood the gentleman's charges in a general way were against the institution. The last part of his plea was for the old soldiers, as though they were suffering some special injustice. Now, what is that injustice?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will state that. I say that they are taking his pension money. I say the record shows he does not get sufficient food. The record shows his clothing is not sufficient. The record shows that he is made to associate with criminal insane, which is wrong—

Mr. KOPP. One more question. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he was ever out at that institution and saw the old soldiers?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No, sir.

Mr. KOPP. I will say for his information that I have been all through it, and not at anyone's invitation.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not yield for the gentleman to make a speech, as I have only two minutes left.

Mr. KOPP. Just a second. It is immaculately clean—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] declines to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say this, and then I am going to close. I have not been there. I am not testifying before this House of my personal knowledge. I am taking the record as it is here. I am taking the sworn testimony of the witnesses before the Olcott committee and this committee. That is what I am arguing this case from. And I will say to the gentleman that I have nothing personal in this matter against Dr. White, or Dr. Black, or anybody else; but I do say that the record in this case shows that it is an outrageous condition of affairs over there, and one that ought not to be tolerated by a Government such as ours. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the criminal insane ought not to mingle with the innocent insane. I say that this pension money ought not to be taken from these people, and I say the food and clothing ought to be of a better character when he is getting about \$300 per

capita each year to take care of them. Now, Mr. Speaker, just one word more.

I have been investigating this matter for five years. I have gone into the records. I have talked with witnesses; I have heard them testify; and I know from their statements what the conditions are, and not from my own knowledge. I have made my fight. And I ask permission, Mr. Speaker, to put in the Record, in connection with my remarks, such parts of the testimony as will be appropriate to the statement I have made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks leave to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman if he proposes to insert anything that has been printed in the hearings?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I hope, Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen will not interrupt.

Mr. MANN. This interruption will not be taken out of the gentleman's time. The gentleman from Florida requested leave to insert some papers in connection with his remarks?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes. They are affidavits and papers that have been presented and letters that have been sent to me.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I regret that I have not the time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida that he be allowed to extend his remarks in the Record? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I simply want to state this, and I crave the indulgence of the House for a second or two. I have made a fight to get this investigation. I have made it from the humanitarian standpoint. I have made the fight, and I have shown the committee that it would cost only \$500. I do not believe it would cost even that much to do it. But I have put this record here so that the House would know and the country would know about these conditions that prevail in sight of this House and in sight of this Capitol of the Nation. [Applause.]

I submit the following letters as a part of my remarks:

Personally appeared before me, the undersigned authority, one Mr. Kelly, the subscriber to this affidavit, who, being duly sworn, says:

That he was employed as an attendant at the Government Hospital for the Insane for about two months during the spring of 1910; that Dr. William A. White was then, as he is now, superintendent of said asylum; that affiant as such attendant was employed in P ward, where about 45 patients were kept, there being two attendants on duty for this number during the daytime and one at night; that some of the patients in P ward were easily excited and dangerous, and that at times some of the patients who became unruly required the use of great force by the attendants in subduing said patients, which was due to the insufficient number of attendants.

That dangerous patients have opportunity to get and use dangerous weapons, such as salt bottles, knives, and forks; that there is no special separation of the classes of cases at meal time; potatoes served with jackets on, and many patients eat them that way. That excited cases placed in side or closed rooms have no arrangement for their toilet or for drinking water; that the meat actually smells from its rotten state when served on the table of the patients and the attendants, and that butterine for bread is not a part of the daily menu; the coffee is poor, and no sugar is served to patients, as affiant has given sugar from the attendants' table to some of the unfortunates. That the clothes served patients are generally misfits and are not seasonable, the same suit often used throughout the year. Frequently the linen for patients and beds would run short; not sufficient help at the table to wait on patients, and frequently not sufficient food served for the needs of the patients. Never saw Dr. White in hospital ward but once; walked hurriedly through and spoke to several patients only. Never saw a minister or priest in the hospital ward, although many were extremely ill, and quite a number died while I was there.

The hours of work for the attendants are from 6 a. m. to 8 p. m., with one half day off each week and one night each week until 12 p. m. And that affiant has knowledge of other facts which will tend to show mismanagement of said institution, and upon an investigation he could and would go into greater detail relative to the facts herein stated.

That affiant further states that he was not discharged from said institution, but left on his own accord because of the conditions existing there.

WM. R. KELLY.

Subscribed and sworn to this 12th day of June, 1911.

[SEAL]

JOHN H. KING,

Notary Public, District of Columbia.

ANACOSTIA, June 12, 1911.

I desire to state that I was an attendant at the Government Hospital for the Insane for the past seven years—resigned on June 3, 1911. That during my seven years of service I have seen many patients go away from the table hungry because there was not sufficient food for them to eat.

The clothing of the inmates was ill-fitting, poor material, not warm enough during the winter.

No sugar put on the tables of the inmates under my care; eggs not more than twice each month.

Frequently the meat had a bad odor, and most always underdone. I have known of patients from Howard Hall (criminal insane) to be in the wards with the innocent insane. I have had working under me on general work in institution's grounds patients of the innocent insane working side by side with the criminal insane patients from Howard Hall. In one case was that of a young boy, a military patient, worked in the same gang with the criminal insane. These same gangs of patients would eat and sleep in the same ward.

No inducement was given or held out to them for working. Have known them to go over a week without any allowance of tobacco.

Never saw Dr. William A. White in the dining room of my patients for over two years; prior to that time only about three or four times in seven years.

The patients received the same weight of underclothing winter and summer (cheap cotton material). Common, coarse, heavy shoes, brogans, and I have had considerable trouble to get a supply of shoes when patients needed them badly.

Never saw the patients under my care, in West Lodge, ever get milk. The buildings were poorly guarded by insecure gratings, easy to escape if patients so desired. Not enough help to wait on the tables; food poorly prepared; seen greens served with sticks in it.

After the newspaper publications as to escapes the authorities put on additional attendants. Not sufficient on duty to prevent harsh treatment of patients and escapes.

West Lodge No. 3 was very cold last winter day and night.

Last winter no rubber boots allowed to patients under me, and, consequently, it was a common thing for the patients to be returned with their feet soaking wet. No changes at hand to dry them.

Butterine is not served at every meal. Towel would serve for many patients, some of whom would be suffering from eruptions on the skin.

Constant complaint among my patients that they did not get enough to eat, clothes not warm in the winter, poor food, etc. I left the institution because of the poor food (compelled to eat two-thirds of my meals outside), poor wages, and bad conditions existing at the institution.

ERNEST BROWN,
2116 Fifteenth Street SE., Anacostia, D. C.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 2, 1911.

HON. FRANK CLARK,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: In reference to the proposed investigation of the administration of St. Elizabeth's Hospital by a committee of the House, I beg to state that I have visited there for 18 years past in the interest of my son, one of the patients, and have had some opportunity of judging of conditions in the ward on the main floor of building R, in which the so-called sick patients are confined.

This ward, I am informed, has a capacity for 50 patients and is nearly always full, yet there is only one water-closet and one bathtub (in a separate room). Obviously this has no tendency to promote cleanliness. In the dormitory in which my son is confined (a wing of the apartment just described) are 14 cots, one directly opposite another, by the side of the entrance to the closet. To obey the calls of nature in summer or winter these invalids must walk barefoot over bare floors, with bare backs exposed through shirts slit from neck to tail. They may obviate this by resorting to the dirty habit of using one of the commodes screened off for their accommodation, to be emptied no one knows when, so that the patients who have no physical ailment are exposed to contamination from the feces of those who have, no less than from the respiration of so great a crowd in so small a space.

These patients, too, are of all ages—from early manhood, through middle life, to old age—so that the natural tendency is for the older to sap the vitality of the younger. Such is nature's law.

My son went into the hospital with a perfect set of teeth. A few years ago we discovered that all the teeth on one side of the upper jaw had been drawn, while all the other teeth were left intact. It is easier to draw than to treat. His was an alleged case of mental imbecility, and it was declared would be progressive. But we have not been able to detect any deterioration in the 18 years of his confinement, except that he has lost the power of speech.

These conditions seem to illustrate the importance of establishing a training school for the mentally defective in this hospital. Many might in time acquire the ability of self-support instead of drifting into indifference and utter helplessness where they become a perpetual charge upon the community.

When the laundered clothing and bedding are delivered, they are dumped in a pile upon the floor, and the attendants lay hold with great energy and, in attempting to distribute them, throw them over the bare floors instead of providing suitable receptacles for them. The game seems to afford them rare sport. The Board of Visitors may be so called in derision, because they never visit.

Very respectfully,

R. T. MORSELL,
1518 P Street NW.

P. S.—Many of these patients are kept in bed continually when they ought to be out getting the air. But it saves attendance to keep them on their backs and perhaps hasten their dissolution.

R. T. M.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 8, 1911.

HON. FRANK CLARK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Responsive to your suggestion that I should write a few words in explanation of my letter to my client, Mr. David R. Watson, dated April 24, 1911, and filed with the Committee on Rules by the Secretary of the Interior, I will state as follows:

On the 11th day of June, 1910, Mr. Watson had a hearing in the supreme court of the District in a habeas corpus proceeding. Drs. Glascock and Franz and Attendants Thompson, Barrie, and Burch testified against Mr. Watson, while he was the only witness in his own behalf, the physician upon whom I was relying being at the time absent from the city.

The testimony was taken stenographically, and I inclose it herewith in typewriting for your examination.

As a summary of the testimony, which was the basis of my letter to Mr. Watson, I will simply state that the hospital physicians admitted under cross-examination that Mr. Watson was temperate, intelligent, had a good memory, was not dangerous; that he did not get

into altercations with other patients unless provoked by them; that he was permitted to go to the city unattended frequently during his entire term of confinement; and that his only so-called "epileptiform convulsions" consisted of not over three occurrences during his 10 years' confinement, resembling a nightmare, happening at night, and occupying only a few minutes, and in one instance only a half minute, according to the testimony of the attendants who observed them, the doctors who testified never having done so. The only "insane delusions" testified to was Mr. Watson's belief that he had been persecuted by Mr. Burch and that Dr. Franz was attempting to hypnotize him. The testimony disclosed the fact that Dr. Franz is a professional hypnotist, whose business it is to hypnotize the patients at St. Elizabeth's, though he testified that he had not attempted to hypnotize Mr. Watson. It further appeared that some years ago, when Mr. Watson, by permission of the District authorities, had set up a small business in Washington for the sale of canes and patriotic songs of his own manufacture and composition to Grand Army men, he had been interfered with by Mr. Burch, who summarily locked him up because he came in late, as he had a right to do by the terms of his pass, and keeping him locked up for several days, thus destroying his business. Mr. Burch, though denying Mr. Watson's statement, admitted under cross-examination that Watson had established a business and that he was confined and prevented from going to the city about the time as charged by Mr. Watson, but that he did so upon the order of the physician in charge, which Mr. Watson denied and stated he was released by that physician as soon as he became aware that he (Watson) was so confined. It is clear that these were not insane delusions, as there were facts upon which his suspicions were based.

It is further intimated in this case that Mr. Watson believed in spiritualism, but there was no proof on that point whatever, and even if he did so believe it would be no evidence of insanity.

The foregoing summary, therefore, shows that the signed statement made by Dr. White to Representative MCKINLEY, forwarded by the secretary to the Committee on Rules in this connection, was neither warranted nor justified by the facts set out in the sworn testimony of the hospital witnesses.

And I will further say that the letters sent to Mr. Watson's daughter and sister by Dr. White have been equally exaggerated and misleading, and calculated to dissuade them from assisting in Mr. Watson's release from the hospital. I would further state that Mr. Watson is not the spendthrift described in Dr. White's letter, but on the contrary has saved up a large part of the enormous income of \$2.50 per month (allowed to him out of his \$15 per month pension), which is supposed to be spent in the purchase of newspapers, postage, tobacco, etc., not furnished by the hospital to the old soldiers.

I expected that the letter I wrote to Mr. Watson would be opened by the hospital authorities, and am much pleased to see Dr. White's statement over his own signature that my letter marked "professional and confidential," and sent through the United States mail, was opened by Dr. White before delivery to Mr. Watson, if delivered at all. If it had reached Mr. Watson and he had copied and returned to me the draft of the letter which I inclosed to him, I should have presented that to the Committee on Rules with an explanation of his case, had the time been afforded me.

Notwithstanding that Mr. Watson was unsupported by other testimony at the trial, the jury were out several hours before returning their verdict against him. I was unable to prosecute an appeal in this case, for the reasons set out in my letter to Mr. Watson, printed in the record of the hearing.

I think it well to state that some time before writing the letter to Mr. Watson, I received information to the effect that he had been again locked up on a closed ward for defending himself against the assault of a patient who had previously assaulted a very infirm old soldier, in whose behalf Mr. Watson had interfered. I wrote to him for particulars, but presume my letter never reached him, as I received no reply.

Kindly return the inclosed testimony, as I desire to bring it to the attention of Mr. MCKINLEY, in Mr. Watson's behalf, in refutation of the statements made in Dr. White's letter to him.

Very respectfully,

RICHARD P. EVANS.

I also append hereto a synopsis of the rules of the Interior Department providing for the distribution of pension money by the Superintendent of St. Elizabeth's, promulgated by Secretary Ballinger, May 1, 1909, under the acts of February 20, 1905, and February 2, 1909:

SYNOPSIS OF RULES.

1. Reserve for pensioner's benefit—
Always one-sixth of pension moneys received.
2. Payment to dependent relatives—
(a) Five-sixths of pension moneys up to \$36 per quarter, inclusive.
(b) \$30 per quarter from \$36 per quarter up to \$60 per quarter, inclusive.
(c) One-half of pension moneys from \$60 per quarter.
3. Payment to nondependent relatives—
Always one-half of corresponding rate to dependent relatives.
4. To hospital for board and maintenance—
(a) Entire balance of pension moneys over and above 1 plus 2 or 3 up to \$55 per quarter, or other rate for board when changed by competent authority.
(b) \$55 per quarter when balance of pension over and above 1 plus 2 or 3 equals or exceeds that amount until changed by competent authority.
5. To pensioner's credit—
Entire balance of pension moneys over and above 1 plus 2 or 3 and plus 4.
6. Dependent relatives are defined in paragraph 9 of the regulations.
7. Nondependent relatives are defined in paragraph 10 of the regulations.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to the gentleman from Texas to make a statement. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield it out of his time? Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes; out of my time.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had thought that the Committee on Rules has enough trouble without the gentleman from Florida turning loose the 3,000 inmates of St. Elizabeth's Asylum against that unfortunate body. [Laughter.] Since the gentleman has inaugurated his fight for an investigation of the

Government Hospital for the Insane we have had a flood of affidavits and letters from the inmates of the institution, and they are still coming. The gentleman from Illinois, Dr. FOSTER, besides making a careful statement in regard to the asylum, will also be able to answer the legal arguments made by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida complained that we had given the superintendent of the asylum and other officials of that institution an opportunity to be heard, and said that we had not followed that policy in the other investigations which have been reported to the House. Let me remind the gentleman that when we passed the resolutions to investigate the Sugar Trust, the Steel Trust, and the affairs of the government of the District of Columbia, we invited those interested on both sides of the controversy to come before the Committee on Rules, and we gave them the fullest opportunity to be heard.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes; for a question.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman said he gave them notice. I would like to ask what sort of notice he gave them?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Through the press and otherwise.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. "Otherwise." How otherwise?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Well, in conversing with those we thought interested in the matter.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh!

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules will be perfectly able to take care of itself in this controversy. Let me say to the House that when the gentleman from Florida introduced his resolution, and it was referred to the Committee on Rules, he was given ample opportunity to be heard. He brought his witnesses—some good witnesses, some discharged employees, and others—to whose statements we did not think we should give the fullest credence.

After the gentleman had fully presented his side of the controversy, Dr. George Lloyd Magruder, of the city of Washington, who stands at the head of the medical profession here, asked, in behalf of the superintendent of the asylum and of the Board of Visitors, that they might be heard, and those gentlemen were invited by the Committee on Rules to present their side. They came. Dr. Magruder made his statement, and also Gen. Torney, the Surgeon General of the United States Army, a member of the Board of Visitors.

Then Mrs. Gen. Sharpe, a member of the board of visitors, addressed the committee in a satisfactory way, and afterwards Mr. Scott C. Bone, a newspaper man of high standing in the District of Columbia, testified, and others gave testimony. And let me assure both sides of the House that after the hearing had been full in every respect, as complete as any gentleman on either side desired, the Committee on Rules did not think the gentleman from Florida had made as strong a case as he alleges here, but did think that those on the other side of the controversy, the board of visitors, composed of eminent persons, had made a good impression. So we have not reported the gentleman's resolution for an investigation. If he has any additional testimony to offer before the Committee on Rules, the case is still open. He can come there and we will be glad to hear him.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Did I not tell the Committee on Rules that if you gentlemen would go into the merits and hear it, I would bring all the witnesses and let you gentlemen pass upon it?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes; and we notified you to bring on your additional witnesses and they would be heard at any time. The Committee on Rules did not agree with the gentleman from Florida that he had made a good case, and therefore his resolution has not been reported.

The Committee on Rules have nothing to cover up on behalf of the Government institution or any other institution in the country. They are willing to have investigations made where they are important and necessary; but we have not come to the conclusion that any good would come from this particular investigation, and therefore have not reported it favorably.

Let me say to the House that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], a member of the Committee on Rules, has visited the asylum and made a careful investigation. He is a gentleman of high standing and will make a statement to the House on behalf of the committee, and I think you will be satisfied when he has finished.

I have no particular objection to the adoption of the resolution which the gentleman offers here this morning, but it seems needless. It is a resolution of inquiry and privileged. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] has had the opportunity to lay his views before the House and the country. As far as the Committee on Rules are concerned, we are satisfied to let the case rest when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] has made his statement on their behalf.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I hope that I may be understood as standing for the rights of humanity, and standing for that unfortunate class of people who are confined in an asylum such as that which the Government has here in the District. I would not want my friend from Florida for one minute to think that I would stand upon the floor of the House of Representatives of the American Congress and defend wrongdoing to those poor unfortunate people who are over there in St. Elizabeth's.

I do not deny, and no one who is connected with that institution or any other institution in this land will deny, that there are at times abuses which creep into a great institution like that. We have them in Illinois, we have them in New York, we have them in Massachusetts, and other States of this Union.

The institution on the hill over across the river contains now nearly 3,000 patients gathered together from all parts of this land. It is a great institution, and I am glad to stand here this morning and offer my voice in defense of the great work that that institution is doing for those unfortunate people. [Applause.]

As was said by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], that institution was organized for the purpose of caring for the insane of the Army more than 50 years ago. I think Dorothy Dix was the one who came to this Congress and secured the appropriation for the large building that was first placed upon that ground.

It went on and on until finally the institution was enlarged, and then they began to take in the insane from the District of Columbia, and then those who came from the soldiers' homes of the country.

Then there came a time when all the insane criminals of the United States were placed over there in the building called Howard Hall.

It is probably within the recollection of some of you here today, and I am sure it is with the ex-Speaker of this House [Mr. CANNON], who will call to mind a number of years ago when he was chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of this House, that he visited this institution and personally saw the needs of certain buildings, and, I believe, through his influence there were built some of the most modern and best buildings there are used to-day for the treatment of the insane of the country.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that there are buildings and conditions there that ought to be remedied, and I submit to this House that there is no man that could be placed in that institution who could, in my judgment, do a better work with the buildings that are now there than Dr. White and the board of directors of that institution.

I want to talk to you a minute about the board of directors connected with that institution. We find on that board are such men as Dr. George Torney, Surgeon General of the Army; the Surgeon General of the Navy; the Surgeon General of the Marine-Hospital Service; they are all members of that board for the reason that enlisted men of the Army and Navy and of the Marine-Hospital Service are confined in that institution, and so the law wisely provided that these men should be members of the board of directors.

There are certain members appointed to the Board of Visitors, as stated by the gentleman from Florida in his attack on the management of this institution.

I want to read to you a minute a little of the testimony that came before the Rules Committee in reference to the visitations of these men and women to that institution.

Dr. Magruder, who is known to the people of Washington as a great physician, said:

I go out there every three months anyhow. During the summer my tour comes two months in succession, and I go to the stated meetings and to the annual meetings. I suppose I go to the institution six or eight times a year.

Then I find that Surg. Gen. Torney said:

I have inspected this hospital on several occasions. I visited all the buildings, all the wards, the dining room, kitchen, Howard Hall, where the criminal insane are kept, and the Administration Building. I have inspected the records of the hospital and read the reports, and I have inquired into the requirements of the institution and its needs of reorganization. I wish to say that I do not know an institution that is better administered and shows greater efficiency in its results

than the Government Hospital for the Insane. Whether it is due to the system instituted by Dr. White or his predecessors, I do not know; but as an institution, it is admirable in every respect.

I want to call attention to the testimony of Scott C. Bone.

The question was asked him how often he visited the hospital. He said every quarter. The chairman asked him if he made extra visits. He said he made a number of extra visits; that he was at the institution last week; that the meeting of the board of regular visitors comes quarterly.

Mrs. Sharp, the wife of Gen. Sharp, is also a member of the board of directors. She says in her testimony that she visited this institution upon the regular meetings, and also that she goes there whenever she is in the city at least every two weeks.

So, when the statement is made on the floor of the House, or anyone makes it before the Committee on Rules, or elsewhere, that these people do not visit the institution and look after it as they should, being members of the board of directors, it is not borne out by the facts.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this matter came up before the Committee on Rules I felt it my duty to visit that institution, and, without invitation from the superintendent, without any notice to the superintendent that I was to be there—although intimated that such was the case by the gentleman from Florida in his remarks—I went over there and spent two days in going over the institution from one end of it to the other. I went into every building there; I went through the kitchens, the dining rooms, and everywhere that it was possible for me to go on these visits.

At the last visit I invited the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kopp] to accompany me, and we went over the institution, as much as we could on that day. We visited Howard Hall, went through the different apartments, went from the bottom to the top, viewing the patients and the condition of the buildings and rooms, as they were at the time; and I want to say to this House that in all the visits that I have made to that institution wherever I went I found nothing wrong in the way of uncleanness and good discipline and good order.

I also went among those patients who are of the worst character that possibly could be found in an institution—a class of patients who are unable to care for themselves in almost any particular—and I want to say that no man, I care not who he may be or where he comes from, can visit that institution and visit those departments who will not come away feeling thankful to the medical profession, and feel that those in charge of that institution have taken advantage of the latest improved way of caring for these patients; and there you will find people who have been confined to their beds for years, and not among them all will you find one afflicted with bed sores, which every physician knows are so apt to be found in that class of people. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Clark] talked about the food—that the food is vile and unfit to eat. I went through the kitchen, and I saw the food that was being prepared for those people, and I want to say to the gentleman from Florida that that food was wholesome—that that food was good. I examined it, and those with me examined it. When the gentleman comes before this House charging that, I want to say that it is evident he has never visited that institution and has never seen the kind of food that is served to the inmates out there. The gentleman from Florida brought in a witness, a Dr. Kelly, along with Mr. Evans, who is one of these pettifogging attorneys here in the city of Washington, a man who is trying to live upon these unfortunate people, getting what little money they have in a fee that he can get out of them for a writ of habeas corpus, and he is mad about that.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. No; I can not yield now.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I just wanted to ask him a question.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I will yield to the gentleman later on. This man, Dr. Kelly, was an honest young man, coming from the State of Kentucky. He was a good young man, and they brought him in there because he had resigned and was going to quit the institution. Why? Because he had made application to be promoted, and he had failed in his examination to get this promotion, so he came before our committee to tell his tale of woe. Outside he said, "Yes; that institution ought to be investigated; that it is the worst institution in the world." And yet when he came before the committee, what do you suppose he said? Why, one of his complaints was that Dr. White would not let the male attendants and the female attendants run together very much.

Another complaint was that the food was bad, and then he was asked in what particular instance the food was bad. He

said one night in Howard Hall they brought in some beans that were so hard you could not crack them with your teeth. Then he was asked if that was reported to Dr. White, and he said it was reported to Dr. Glick, who was the assistant. He was then asked what was done, and he said that Dr. White went after them, and things were better after that, showing that whenever those things were called to the attention of Dr. White he immediately took steps to remedy the condition and make it better. [Applause.] I give it to you on my reputation, if it is worth anything in this House, that the food in that institution is not bad, and is wholesome, and is good enough for anybody to eat. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I just want to ask the gentleman a question or two. Did not Dr. Kelly flatly contradict Dr. White with reference to the night of the escape, by saying that there was only one attendant on the ward that night?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes; I think he did.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, one other question. The gentleman speaks of Mr. Evans as a pettifogging lawyer, who was trying to live on habeas-corpus suits. I know that he wants to be fair. And does it not appear that Mr. Evans has lived here since 1865, that he is a Mason in good standing, that he is a member of the Methodist Church, a Knight of Pythias, and a member of the bar here in good standing?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Well, that is probably so, but I want to remind my friend from Florida of an incident that I once heard a friend of mine relate. He lived in the same county. His father was a good man and he owned a large farm out in Illinois. His word was good at any time for what he wanted to buy, and the son said to me, "One time I went to Olney [where I live now] and I went out to a mill to buy some feed, and after I had loaded it on the wagon I went to pay for it and found that I had spent more money [as a young man might do], and I had not sufficient to pay for the load. I said to the miller, 'I have not sufficient money to pay for the feed; I do not have it here; you know me; you know my father; you know who he is.' 'Yes,' he said, 'that is true; I know your father; he is a good man'; but he said, 'I want to tell you some good men have mighty bad sons.'" [Laughter and applause.] And so I would want more recommendation than the gentleman from Florida offers upon this floor in defense of his old-time investigator and agitator, Mr. Evans, who writes to patients in that institution, marking the letters "personal and confidential," and then invites them to "copy these letters" and also give him the names of other patients in that institution who might want to get out on writs of habeas corpus that he may also make terms with them and make a little fee out of them for himself. [Applause.] I am not a lawyer—

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman permit me a question? I was about to say I believe the gentleman is a reputable physician. In the gentleman's opinion, would a physician or a lawyer be better qualified to judge the merits of the management of an insane hospital?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Well, I would think that if you are looking for a person to take charge of an insane asylum or to look over the inmates of that institution and the conditions existing there you would most certainly employ a physician. I have great respect for the legal profession. It has done a noble work in this country for the rights and liberties of men, but I want to say to you whatever its ability it is not in the practice of medicine.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I do.

Mr. BARNHART. I want to inquire if it is not a fact that all institutions with large numbers of people congregated therein must not prescribe a plain diet, although a wholesome and substantial diet, in order to preserve the health of the inmates of the institution?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Certainly; that is understood by all medical men, that the patient would have prescribed for him a certain diet, according to his needs; and I know from my own investigation of that institution and the data that is given on this subject over there and my talk with Dr. White in reference to the kind of diet he gives these people and how he varies it, and I am sure he has placed that institution upon a scientific basis, measuring, as he does, the kind of food and amount of food for each person, by which I know he has solved the great problem of economical feeding and, in feeding those patients, the kind and quantity of food they require and best adapted to their condition.

Mr. KOPP. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I do.

Mr. KOPP. A large percentage of the patients are confined to their beds, are they not?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Quite a number of them.

Mr. KOPP. I would like to ask the gentleman to give us his opinion, as a physician, as to the treatment those who are helpless receive as compared with that received in any first-class hospital.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. A few moments ago I said that the treatment was as good as any institution in this country. I say you can find no institution in the world where that class are better cared for than over there on the hill.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to qualify neither as a lawyer nor as a physician, but just as a matter of plain common sense. I am ready to concede, for the sake of the argument, because I do not wish to go into that question, as the doctor well knows, as to the treatment these patients receive, whether they are sufficiently fed or sufficiently clothed or properly cared for; but there is a matter that, I believe, received the serious consideration of this House and about which the very eminent and learned alienist who is now addressing us is qualified to speak—

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I am not an alienist; I am just—

Mr. STANLEY. The gentleman is everything that the medical profession requires.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois (continuing). I am just a plain doctor.

Mr. STANLEY. Now, it developed in that testimony that there is no adequate means of retaining any man in this institution who wants to get out of it. And if he is retained he is kept within a brick court. He is held a prisoner. Now, great numbers of the insane have, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] well knows, a homicidal mania, and whether they be paranoiacs or whether they be epileptics, or whether they be men suffering from dementia præcox or other mental diseases, they often develop the false idea that they may save society or punish their own wrongs by taking the life of somebody else. There are hundreds of such people in St. Elizabeth's. There is no one of them, as I understand, who either can not get out, or, if prevented from escaping, is held as a prisoner. A man with a homicidal mania is no more to blame for it than the man who believes he is the Apostle Paul or the King of England. He should have exercise in the open air, be allowed to work in the fields under proper guidance. Now, whether they be strictly paranoiacs, or whether they be men with a homicidal mania, they usually assume that they are wronged by some man high in authority. It is their tendency to slay Presidents, Speakers of the House, Judges of the Supreme Court, and the like. We have had a number of instances of homicides committed by paranoiacs.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I hope that suggestion will have nothing to do with our Speaker of the House now. [Laughter.]

Mr. STANLEY. Now, I wish to ask the gentleman, and I am making this inquiry in all seriousness, if he regards it as safe or practicable to keep criminal insane in an institution of that kind, within a few hundred yards of the city of Washington, with facilities for escape at hand?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Answer, yes or no. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Go ahead.

Mr. RUCKER of Missouri. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, partly in answer to the gentleman—

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I wish the gentleman would not take my time just now. I thought he simply wanted to ask a question.

I want to say to my friend from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] I do not desire to engage in the field of the different kinds of lunacy, and I want to say this to him, that while I believe it would be better to remove that institution farther from the city of Washington, I want you to remember this, the Presidents who have been assassinated in this country have not been assassinated by escaped convicts or by those who have escaped from lunatic asylums.

Mr. STANLEY. Will the gentleman yield for just a minute?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. For just a question, I will.

Mr. STANLEY. Were not two, if not three, of the Presidents of the United States assassinated by men whom you would qualify as distinct types of paranoiacs?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I would not say as to that, but it is likely so. What I am saying is that these men were not men who escaped from any insane asylum, nor were they convicted of insanity before any court or tribunal in this country.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Just a question.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I want to ask the gentleman if it has occurred to him that if this distinguished pettifogger he has referred to is interested in the soldier inmates getting large pensions he is interested in getting control of the money?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. I can not answer the gentleman. That may be so, but I have not found it out.

But I want to say a few words, because my good friend from Florida [Mr. CLARK] has exercised such great interest in the old soldiers of our country, and I compliment him for standing upon this floor and eulogizing them, because I have no doubt that he means every word that he says. But I want to say that in that institution there are old soldiers and sailors who are sick and afflicted in many ways; some have only one arm, or one leg, and one especially I noticed there who had no limbs at all below the knees. And the pathetic thing that struck me when I came into the corridor where that old soldier was confined was that he got down from the chair in which he was sitting and stood on his stubs of legs and saluted as only a trained soldier knows how to salute. And I will tell you, my friends, when you go there and see the fine way in which those men are cared for it can not help but touch you and make you feel that these men in the declining years of their lives, who are unfortunately insane and must be confined in an institution—you can not help but feel that, thank God, we have a place where they are so well cared for as they are in that great institution across the river. No man in this House will fight harder or longer to right any wrong done one of these defenders of our country, and I would not for one moment see one of them mistreated in the least.

I found none of those old soldiers and sailors in Howard Hall. But I want to be perfectly frank and fair with this House and say that there is some little in what the gentleman from Florida says, because occasionally there comes to that institution one of those old soldiers or sailors who has criminal ideas and homicidal ideas in his head, who does things that he ought not to do; and that man ought not to be housed with these innocent, good men located in the other parts of that institution. There occasionally comes a time when a man of that kind is confined in Howard Hall. That is all there is to it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to his colleague?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I just wanted to ask what Howard Hall is.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Howard Hall is the place where the criminal insane are kept. Those who come from Leavenworth and Atlanta penitentiaries are confined there.

Mr. BUCHANAN. They are kept separate from the others?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes; they are kept separate from the others—those that are insane. They are confined in a building quite a distance from the others.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I do not want to be offensive, and I am not trying to be facetious, but I would like to know which side of the resolution the gentleman is on. [Laughter.] The chairman of the Rules Committee [Mr. HENRY] said he had no objection to the passage of this resolution of inquiry. Does the gentleman from Illinois take that stand?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the gentleman from New Jersey reminded me of that. I want to say to this House that I believe it is our duty to vote down this resolution. Let that institution over there rest and do not keep on stirring up matters here and making bad the discipline of that institution. Vote down that resolution. Let the institution alone, and I am sure the men who have charge of it, if there are any abuses that do arise, will correct them, just as such abuses would be corrected in any other institution in all this land.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. In just a minute. I want to say this, Mr. Speaker, in reference to what my friend from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], who has more than ordinary knowledge of this subject, said in regard to the insane people confined in institutions of that kind. You should not get the idea that they are all wild and violent and have to be restrained. Some of them, as suggested by the gentleman, are as cunning and smart as they can be, and when an agitation of this sort is going on, when an investigation of this kind is being proposed and debated in Congress and in the newspapers of this city, you can not avoid having bad discipline in that institution among that class of patients; and then when a man like our old pettifogging lawyer, Evans, is continually stirring up strife and creating trouble for that institution, I believe this Congress ought to set its foot down upon this thing now and let that institution alone.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. This resolution is simply asking the Secretary of the Interior to furnish to the House whatever information he has. Is the gentleman opposed to the passage of that resolution seeking this information?

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Oh, I know, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Florida, who says that for five long years, with his old friend Evans, he has attempted to investigate this institution, and each time he has met with defeat. Now, as a last resort, as a final triumph, when he might be able to get hold of something that would enable him to come back to Congress again, he goes to the Committee on Rules and comes to this House and asks you that an investigation be had. He now takes the little innocent—as he thinks—resolution, and wants to have some information from the Interior Department.

Why, bless your soul, the committee appointed on the Expenditures in the Interior Department can get all that information any time they want it. Now, let us put our foot down upon this sort of agitation. Let us stand by these men who are doing this noble work.

In conclusion I want to say just one word about pensions. It has been attempted to be shown that the pension money of these old soldiers is taken from them and put into the treasury of the institution. I would have you know that this is partially true, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] is mistaken as to the other part.

A portion of the money of these old soldiers is retained to buy certain articles for their special comfort. I think it is one-fifth or one-sixth of it that is retained and spent to buy little extra things for them. A portion of it goes to the wife, if there is one, or if not, to children under 16 years of age. If there be a dependent father or mother, it goes to them. All these accounts are audited down here in the office of the Auditor for the Interior Department, and I want to say to my friend from Florida [Mr. CLARK] that if he has any old soldier in that institution from his district, if he will write to Dr. White he can get a statement of what is done with the pension of that soldier, and verify the statement through the Treasury Department. I did that and found that those accounts were all right, and there was nothing at all but what ought to have been done in the case of this soldier that I speak of.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want it to be understood that I stand for the old soldier as much as my friend from Florida does, and I do not want him to feel that he stands here in this House alone to champion the rights of the old soldiers in that institution. I want to be counted with the friends of the old soldier, and I believe that if the gentleman from Florida will visit that institution, look it over, and see the place out there, which in the press of the country has been denominated the "bull pen," he will find there a beautiful park of 7 acres where these ex soldiers and sailors are permitted to exercise and enjoy themselves the best that it is possible for men of that kind to do. What has been said about that is one of the misrepresentations of that institution.

So, I say, let us determine to put an end to this agitation. Let us put a stop to the efforts of the men on the outside of this institution who want to make a living out of these unfortunate people. I do not refer to any Member of Congress when I say that. Let us declare ourselves against that as we ought to do, and let us declare ourselves in favor of the proper management of that institution. Then, I am sure that when you go and look that institution over, if you will, you will find things that ought to be corrected, and you will come back here feeling that Congress has not done as much as it ought to do in the way

of affording proper quarters, and so forth, for that great institution.

I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KOPP].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KOPP] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, prior to two months ago, if I had been asked to name the superintendent of St. Elizabeth's, I could not have done so. Prior to the day when I went out there with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] I had never seen the man. We were not invited to come there. No human being other than ourselves knew that we were going, but, in the face of the serious charges filed by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], we decided to go out there, and we investigated the institution as well as we could.

Now, I do not pretend to qualify as a physician or as an alienist, but I do claim that I can tell when an institution is clean, when the food is good, and when everybody seems to be as well satisfied as they could be under the circumstances.

We went through ward after ward. The floors were immaculately clean, the beds had the cleanest kind of linen. We asked 50 employees, if we asked one, whether there was vermin of any kind or description about the premises, and everyone told us there was not. We went into the kitchen. No one knew we were coming. We went there just at dinner time. We inspected the food. We saw them eating in their dining room, and I want to corroborate the statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] that it was just as good food and as well cooked and as wholesome as anybody could ask for.

Now, it does seem to me that this resolution ought not to pass; not because two or three of us have been there to inspect the place, but because a prima facie case has not been made out by the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. KOPP. In one moment. Everybody knows that the most difficult kind of an institution, eleemosynary or charitable, in all the world is an insane asylum; that a peculiar kind of discipline is needed there that is not needed anywhere else, and that when there is agitation of this kind, exciting otherwise unbalanced minds, it is very difficult indeed for the superintendent and those associated with him to carry on their work. So unless there is at least a prima facie case made, it seems to me we are not being fair to the men whom we have placed in charge of that great institution to order this investigation.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I just want to say that the pending resolution is simply requiring the Secretary of the Interior to furnish certain information.

Mr. KOPP. I realize that, but the pending resolution is something to keep this agitation boiling, and it will afford the means of another step forward in this investigation, which we do not want. The gentleman criticizes Dr. White because he has been around the country lecturing. Dr. White is not only one of the greatest alienists in this community, but he is one of the greatest in the world, and are you going to say to him, because he goes to meetings of scientific men to lecture to them and gives them the benefit of his great knowledge and experience, that he ought not to do it? When we were over there there was another great alienist from Toronto to investigate and get suggestions from this institution because it is recognized, as he said, throughout the world as one of the greatest, one of the most advanced in the treatment of insane patients that there is. Now you criticize him because he is attempting to alleviate those affected with this misfortune all over the world.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that the testimony before the Committee on Rules showed that Dr. White made a trip every year to Europe to study the problems he had to deal with, and when he came back to the institution he always put in operation a lot of new things he had learned while abroad.

Mr. KOPP. Dr. White has visited institutions all over the country and all over Europe and other parts of the world to get information, and I think the testimony of my colleague, Dr. FOSTER, shows that he has used it to good advantage. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would not be fair to the management of that institution to precipitate an investigation when there is nothing to be gained thereby.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Florida made a most astounding statement in regard to the money received by soldiers who are inmates of the Government Hospital for the Insane. He made the statement that five-sixths of the amount received went into the general fund for the maintenance of the institution. Now, I think he is en-

tirely mistaken, and I believe the gentleman does not want to have in the RECORD a misstatement. I call his attention to the hearings before the special committee of investigation of the Government Hospital for the Insane in May and December of 1906. I read from volume 2, page 1217. Mr. Evans testified as follows:

Mr. HAY. There is one thing I would like to ask you. I inquired of Dr. White about it, and I have not got it clear in my mind. In the case of a man drawing a pension before the act of February 20, 1905, do I understand that all of it goes into the hospital?

Mr. EVANS. Every dollar, whether it was \$6 a month of \$100 a month; every dollar went into the fund of the hospital for general purposes and not for the special benefit of this man, and all the money is retained there. There is a big fund now in the Treasury of the United States where the parties have died.

Mr. HAY. And it is used there?

Mr. EVANS. It is used there for general purposes. They could use it on the streets, on the roads, and for painting fences, etc.

Mr. HAY. You say it is retained in the Treasury?

Mr. EVANS. Quite an amount that had not been expended is put to the credit of the hospital in the Treasury account. I have seen some statements here about that. Since the passage of the act of February 20, 1905, the pension money is cut up. It is cut up on the basis of about a sixth. For instance, take a pension of \$8 a month, stating the figures approximately: About \$1.34 of that is set aside for any little needs or wants of the soldier. About \$3.33 is set aside for a fund to be turned over to him in case of his discharge, and \$3.33 a month is retained for his care and maintenance in the hospital. In the event that he has dependent relatives and others from the outside, there is some provision made, I believe, that a part shall go to them in the small pensions.

Then, on page 1385, Dr. White, in testifying, said, in the event of death or discharge of a pensioner who has such relatives, then the money is paid, if he has not recovered, to his guardian, or if he has, to him or to those dependent relatives. If he dies and there are no such beneficiaries, under the pension act the money goes to the general purposes of the hospital.

He says a certain portion of it goes for board and maintenance. It goes to the wife, dependent parents, and minor children in the order named, and we pay out every quarter to all the pensioners who have dependent relatives the pro rata portion of the pension which is due them. It is done every quarter. When the pension money comes in immediately there is issued checks to these relatives.

There is no doubt but that the gentleman from Florida is very much mistaken in his statement that five-sixths of this amount is used for the maintenance of the institution.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me there?

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will put in the RECORD testimony showing that that is absolutely the fact, that they do get five-sixths.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. What does the gentleman say as to this record that I have read?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I did not hear all that the gentleman had read.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. I am certain that the gentleman is mistaken, because I had a case where I had occasion to look the matter up.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is it, and the gentleman will find that.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. And the law which the gentleman read, which is the act of February, 1905, applies to this institution as well as to the soldiers' homes throughout the country.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; and I stated that the construction was a strained one; but under that they did take five-sixths of it, and I will put it in the RECORD.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentleman from Florida and of the House, I will state exactly how pensions are disposed of belonging to soldiers in this particular institution, and I make this statement after having made an inquiry to ascertain in regard to it.

When the soldier has a pension of \$12 per month, the wife gets \$10, and \$2 is set aside for his benefit. If he gets \$15, the wife would get \$10, he would get \$2.50 and the institution \$2.50. If he gets \$20, one-half goes to his wife, one-third to himself, and the balance is retained by the institution. This rule as to proportion prevails up to \$55 per month. If the pension is \$72 per month, the wife gets \$36, he gets \$12, the institution \$18.33, and the balance goes to his credit. If he is discharged from the hospital, he is paid the amount to his credit. If he is taken out by a guardian, the guardian receives it. If he is returned to some soldiers' home, the amount due him is turned over to the treasurer of the home. If he dies and has a wife, she receives what is due him, but if he has no wife, then it goes to the institution.

According to the testimony taken before the committee, to which I have already referred, out of a total of about \$100,000 annually received by the Government Hospital on account of pensions, the institution only received about \$20,000, or one-fifth

of the whole amount, and this included moneys that went to the institution because the soldiers had no wives.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the previous question was ordered.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recognized for 10 minutes before the previous question is ordered.

Mr. HAY. But the previous question has been ordered.

The SPEAKER. The previous question has been ordered.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. If I can withhold the demand—

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman can not withhold it after it has been ordered.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Those opposed will rise and stand until counted.

Mr. CLARK of Florida (interrupting the count). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-nine Members present; not a quorum.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey) there were—ayes 46, noes 71.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, were the yeas and nays refused on the demand of the gentleman from Florida?

The SPEAKER. The Chair had not finished the count when the gentleman from Florida withdrew his demand for the yeas and nays and made the point of no quorum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But the gentleman did not withdraw it. The Chair had counted, but failed to announce the result of his count.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had counted the affirmative, but he had not counted the negative; in fact, the negative had not been called for, and the gentleman from Florida rose in his place and made the point of no quorum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The other side was not demanded.

Mr. MANN. The Chair was counting on the call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The Chair counted those standing in the affirmative, on the call for the yeas and nays, without announcing whether there was a sufficient number. The other side was not demanded, and I think that the Chair should announce that there was not a sufficient number, and that the yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The situation was this: The yeas and nays were demanded, and the Chair counted those in favor of ordering the yeas and nays. The Chair then asked those who were opposed to ordering the yeas and nays to rise in order to ascertain whether a sufficient number had voted for the yeas and nays, because that is the only way you can ascertain it when there has not been a vote. Before the Chair announced the count of the other side, the gentleman from Florida made the point of no quorum. The Chair then counted the House, and announced that there was not a quorum present, and the rule automatically makes a call of the House under the circumstances.

Mr. CARTER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. What are we voting on?

The SPEAKER. The Chair was about to state that when the roll was called those in favor of adopting this resolution will vote "aye," and those opposed will vote "no."

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, let us have the resolution read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resolution will be again reported.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors; the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees; the question is on

agreeing to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 79, nays 124, answered "present" 10, not voting 174, as follows:

YEAS—79.

Alexander	Edwards	Johnson, S. C.	Roddenbery
Allen	Ellerbe	Kendall	Rubey
Ashbrook	Floyd, Ark.	Lafean	Sharp
Austin	Focht	Lewis	Sherley
Bathrick	Fowler	Lobeck	Slisson
Bell, Ga.	Francis	McGillcuddy	Slayden
Blackmon	Goeke	Macon	Smith, J. M. C.
Brown	Goodwin, Ark.	Mays	Stanley
Byrnes, S. C.	Gray	Morse, Wis.	Stephens, Cal.
Byrns, Tenn.	Gregg, Tex.	Nye	Stephens, Miss.
Candler	Hamill	Oldfield	Sulzer
Clark, Fla.	Hardy	O'Shaunessy	Thayer
Cline	Heffin	Page	Thistlewood
Collier	Helgesen	Post	Thomas
Cox, Ind.	Helm	Prouty	Towner
Cox, Ohio	Houston	Randell, Tex.	Watkins
Dent	Howard	Rauch	Webb
Dickson, Miss.	Hughes, Ga.	Redfield	Woods, Iowa
Dixon, Ind.	Jacoway	Reilly	Young, Kans.
Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Richardson	

NAYS—124.

Adair	Farr	Konop	Robinson
Ayres	Fitzgerald	Kopp	Rucker, Mo.
Beall, Tex.	Flood, Va.	La Follette	Russell
Booher	Fordney	Lindbergh	Sabath
Borland	Foss	Linthicum	Scully
Buchanan	Foster, Ill.	Littlepage	Shackleford
Burke, S. Dak.	Foster, Vt.	Lloyd	Slemp
Burleson	French	Longworth	Sloan
Burnett	Garner	McCall	Speer
Calder	Garrett	McCoy	Stedman
Cannon	George	McDermott	Steenerson
Carter	Good	McKenzie	Stephens, Tex.
Catlin	Graham	McKinney	Stone
Conry	Gregg, Pa.	Maguire, Nebr.	Sulloway
Cooper	Gudger	Malby	Sweet
Copley	Hamilton, W. Va.	Mann	Talbot, Md.
Covington	Hamlin	Martin, Colo.	Taylor, Colo.
Cullop	Hardwick	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Ohio
Danforth	Harrison, Miss.	Morgan	Tribble
Daugherty	Harrison, N. Y.	Needham	Tuttle
Davenport	Haugen	Nelson	Warburton
Davidson	Hay	Padgett	Wedemeyer
Davis, Minn.	Heald	Parran	Weeks
Dickinson	Henry, Tex.	Payne	Whitacre
Dodds	Hensley	Pickett	White
Dwight	Holland	Pray	Wickliffe
Dyer	Hughes, N. J.	Rainey	Willis
Esch	Hull	Raker	Wilson, Ill.
Estopinal	Humphrey, Wash.	Randsell, La.	Witherspoon
Evans	Humphreys, Miss.	Rees	Young, Mich.
Falson	Kahn	Roberts, Nev.	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—10.

Adamson	Berger	Hinds	Norris
Barnhart	Currier	Korbly	
Bartlett	Gallagher	Moore, Tex.	

NOT VOTING—174.

Aiken, S. C.	Dupre	Konig	Plumley
Akin, N. Y.	Fairchild	Lafferty	Porter
Ames	Ferris	Lamb	Pou
Anderson, Minn.	Fields	Langham	Powers
Anderson, Ohio	Finley	Langley	Prince
Andrus	Fornes	Latta	Pujo
Ansberry	Fuller	Lawrence	Reyburn
Anthony	Gardner, Mass.	Lee, Ga.	Riordan
Barchfeld	Gardner, N. J.	Lee, Pa.	Roberts, Mass.
Bartholdt	Gillett	Legare	Rodenberg
Bates	Glass	Lenroot	Rothermel
Bingham	Godwin, N. C.	Lever	Rouse
Boehne	Goldfogle	Levy	Rucker, Colo.
Bowman	Gordon	Lindsay	Saunders
Bradley	Gould	Littleton	Sells
Brantley	Greene	Loud	Sheppard
Broussard	Griest	Loudenslager	Sherwood
Bulkeley	Guernsey	McCreary	Simmons
Burke, Pa.	Hamilton, Mich.	McGuire, Okla.	Sims
Burke, Wis.	Hammond	McHenry	Small
Butler	Hanna	McKinley	Smith, Saml. W.
Callaway	Harris	McLaughlin	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell	Hartman	McMorran	Smith, Tex.
Cantrill	Hawley	Madden	Sparkman
Carlin	Hayes	Madison	Stack
Cary	Henry, Conn.	Maher	Sterling
Claypool	Higgins	Martin, S. Dak.	Stevens, Minn.
Clayton	Hill	Matthews	Switzer
Connell	Hobson	Miller	Talcott, N. Y.
Crago	Howell	Mitchell	Taylor, Ala.
Cravens	Howland	Mondell	Tilson
Crumpacker	Hubbard	Moon, Pa.	Townsend
Curley	Hughes, W. Va.	Moon, Tenn.	Turnbull
Dalzell	Jackson	Morrison	Underhill
Davis, W. Va.	James	Moss, Ind.	Underwood
De Forest	Jones	Mott	Utter
Denver	Kennedy	Murdock	Volstead
Dies	Kent	Murray	Vreeland
Difenderfer	Kindred	Olmsted	Wilder
Donohoe	Kinkaid, Nebr.	Palmer	Wilson, N. Y.
Doremus	Kinkead, N. J.	Patten, N. Y.	Wilson, Pa.
Draper	Kipp	Patton, Pa.	Wood, N. J.
Driscoll, D. A.	Kitchin	Pepper	
Driscoll, M. E.	Knowland	Peters	

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until June 19, inclusive:
 Mr. DONOHOE with Mr. WILDER.
 For ten days:
 Mr. LEE of Georgia with Mr. HARTMAN.
 Until further notice:
 Mr. MOORE of Texas with Mr. HAYES.
 Mr. BARNHART with Mr. SIMMONS.
 Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. PATTON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. BARCHFELD.
 Mr. CRAVENS with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.
 Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin with Mr. LAFFERTY.
 Mr. WILSON of New York with Mr. SWITZER.
 Mr. TALCOTT of New York with Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH.
 Mr. STACK with Mr. SELLS.
 Mr. TURNBULL with Mr. MITCHELL.
 Mr. TOWNSEND with Mr. STERLING.
 Mr. SMITH of New York with Mr. WOOD of New Jersey.
 Mr. SMITH of Texas with Mr. PORTER.
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. KENT.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. PLUMLEY.
 Mr. SHERWOOD with Mr. RODENBERG.
 Mr. SHEPPARD with Mr. TILSON.
 Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. RUCKER of Colorado with Mr. KNOWLAND.
 Mr. ROTHERMEL with Mr. REYBURN.
 Mr. POU with Mr. MILLER.
 Mr. PETERS with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.
 Mr. PATTEN of New York with Mr. LOUD.
 Mr. MOSS of Indiana with Mr. OLMSTED.
 Mr. MORRISON with Mr. MADISON.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. LANGLEY.
 Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. JACKSON.
 Mr. LEVY with Mr. MCCREARY.
 Mr. LEVER with Mr. KINKAID of Nebraska.
 Mr. LAMB with Mr. HUBBARD.
 Mr. KONIG with Mr. HIGGINS.
 Mr. KINKAID of New Jersey with Mr. HOWELL.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. DE FOREST.
 Mr. CLAYPOOL with Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey.
 Mr. CARTER with Mr. MATTHEWS.
 Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. KENNEDY.
 Mr. HAMMOND with Mr. PRINCE.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. HENRY of Connecticut.
 Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL with Mr. CRAGO.
 Mr. DIES with Mr. CARY.
 Mr. DENVER with Mr. CAMPBELL.
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. HARRIS.
 Mr. CARLIN with Mr. GREENE.
 Mr. CLAYTON with Mr. CRUMPACKER.
 Mr. BULKLEY with Mr. BOWMAN.
 Mr. BROUSSARD with Mr. BINGHAM.
 Mr. BOEHNE with Mr. BATES.
 Mr. ANSBERRY with Mr. ANTHONY.
 Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio with Mr. ANDERSON of Minnesota.
 Mr. AIKEN of South Carolina with Mr. AMES.
 Mr. GOLDFOGLE with Mr. BARTHOLDT.
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. GUERNSEY.
 Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia with Mr. GILLET.
 Mr. CURLEY with Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts.
 Mr. MCHENRY with Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota.
 Mr. FIELDS with Mr. HAWLEY.
 Mr. CONNELL with Mr. MICHAEL E. DRISCOLL.
 Mr. KINDRED with Mr. LENROOT.
 Mr. LATTI with Mr. MONDELL.
 Mr. GORDON with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.
 Mr. MURRAY with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.
 Mr. KITCHIN with Mr. MADDEN.
 Mr. UNDERWOOD with Mr. DALZELL.
 Mr. HOBSON with Mr. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. DUPEE with Mr. HANNA.
 Mr. LEGARE with Mr. McLAUGHLIN.
 Mr. ADAMSON with Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota.
 Mr. ROUSE with Mr. VREELAND.
 Mr. DIFENDERFER with Mr. LAWRENCE.
 Mr. JAMES with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.
 Mr. KIPP with Mr. LANGHAM.
 Mr. LITTLETON with Mr. HOWLAND.
 Mr. GLASS with Mr. HILL.
 Mr. PEPPER with Mr. MURDOCK.
 Mr. FERRIS with Mr. DRAPER.
 Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. FULLER.
Mr. PALMER with Mr. GRIEST.
Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.
Mr. UNDERHILL with Mr. UTTER.
Mr. BARTLETT with Mr. BUTLER.

For the session:

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. ANDRUS.
Mr. FINLEY with Mr. CURRIER.
Mr. FURNES with Mr. BRADLEY.
Mr. PUJO with Mr. McMORRAN.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in printing certain letters which I was given consent to put in the RECORD, I would ask unanimous consent of the House to leave out the names of the writers of the letters.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to hear.

The SPEAKER. The point of order of the gentleman from Illinois is well taken. The House will be in order. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] will state his request.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will state that the House gave me unanimous consent to print certain letters in my remarks. The persons writing those letters, or some of them at least, are averse to having their names known, and I want to ask unanimous consent to print the letters without the names. And one thing further. Reference is made to a Representative in Congress in the letter which I read, and I want to leave his name out.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that in printing these letters, when extending his remarks in the RECORD, he may leave off the names of the persons who wrote them and also leave out the name of the Member of Congress referred to.

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, is it the idea of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] that it will be a good thing to print what will substantially appear as anonymous letters containing statements concerning this institution, located right here, and which letters will undoubtedly be read by the inmates and employees of that institution and will undoubtedly excite them?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that I can print the names on some of them. They do not make any request that I shall not do so. Now, in the letter that I read, for instance, the writer especially asks that his name be not used.

Mr. MANN. The letter the gentleman read goes into the RECORD as part of his remarks. Now, the gentleman himself, I think, very properly—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I see the point the gentleman makes, and I will not publish those, with the exception of the one I read, without the names. But I do want to leave out the name of the Representative.

Mr. MANN. Nobody objects to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

PAY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs have instructed me to report favorably House resolution 208, introduced by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COVINGTON]. It is a privileged resolution, covering an inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send it to the desk. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SWEET] calls up the following resolution by authority of the Committee on Military Affairs, which the Clerk will read, together with the report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 208.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the House of Representatives copies of all records, reports, letters, or papers of any description which, on June 14, 1911, were in or recorded in any bureau or office of the War Department, or were in the custody of any civil or military officer or employee in any bureau or office of the War Department, and which relate in any way to charges or accusations of criminal or other misconduct on the part of any officer or officers of the Pay Department of the Army since January 1, 1905, or which relate in any way to absence from duty since January 1, 1905, of any such officer or officers against whom such charges or accusations have been made.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the resolution. I would like to know if there is any way of getting a copy of it?

Mr. HAY. The gentleman can get a copy of it in the document room.

Mr. MANN. Just at present it would not do me any good to go there and get a copy of it. I am afraid it would be passed before I could do so. The gentleman bringing up resolutions ought to have copies on the floor.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the report (No. 51).
The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred House resolution 208, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it be passed.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, I will yield a portion of my time to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COVINGTON], who is more familiar with the matter than I am.

Mr. COVINGTON. I think in three or four minutes I can satisfy the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in regard to the purport of this resolution. It simply calls upon the Secretary of War to transmit to the House copies of records and letters and papers relating to any charges of criminal misconduct or accusations of that character made against any officers of the Pay Corps of the Army since January 1, 1905. And I desire to state very frankly that it is intended to cover simply a period which will refer to a particular case that information has been obtained upon, and which is sufficiently accurate to warrant such transmission of records. It calls for no documents other than those ordinary papers relating to the charges against officials of the Pay Corps within that period. If there are none in the department, none will be transmitted. As a matter of fact, it simply asks the transmittal promptly of such documents as affect charges made against pay officers in the Army within that period, for the purpose of giving the House the present condition of the Pay Corps.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COVINGTON. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. If there should be any charges of misconduct on the part of any officer in the Pay Department, whether founded or unfounded, though it might be desirable not to make those charges public in the interest both of the service and of good government, possibly the prosecution of the officer, possibly in his interest, under this resolution those charges would have to be published to the world.

Does the gentleman desire to have that done and make that a rule, that if charges are ever presented against any official of the Army or the Navy, thereupon Congress shall direct that those charges be made public by printing in the House proceedings or as a House document?

Mr. COVINGTON. I will say to the gentleman that when any charges are made against any officer in any department of this Government, which are of a criminal character, the good of the service is always subserved by the publicity of those charges. If the man be innocent, the very unsubstantial nature of the charges constitutes his best defense before the American people. On the other hand, the preservation of secrecy in those charges may oftentimes lead to abuses, even in the best administered of administrative departments. I can see no reason why charges of a criminal nature should not under all circumstances be given publicity. If those charged with crime in the civil walks of life have indictments against them, although they subsequently may have acquittals at the bar of justice, nevertheless, my good friend the gentleman from Illinois knows that publicity comes to them. Acquittal is their justification, and certainly no injury can be done a man simply because he happens to be in the military branch of the service, by the publication of charges of criminality which have been lodged against him.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if there is any Member of Congress who has never been charged with wrongdoing or misdoing, he is a strange Member of Congress.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. He is a new Member. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. He is not worth much. Now, the question is whether, if such charges are made, we are to publish them with the sanction of the House in all cases. I can readily understand, and I think everybody here can understand, that there might be charges or evidence in the War Department which it is not advisable or desirable to make public; either, on the one side, in the interest of the Government, or, on the other side, in the interest of the person. I have no doubt that many false charges are made, but this would require that all papers which relate to any kind of charges shall be sent to Congress, and, automatically, they will be published as House documents.

Mr. COVINGTON. I apprehend that certainly within the short period of six years the pay corps of the Army of the United States has not degenerated to such an extent that the transmission of charges of criminal misconduct against its officers would constitute a very voluminous document. If it is so, then it is time that some radical reorganization should take place in that corps.

Mr. MANN. This does not have to be criminal misconduct at all. But, even if it were, a resolution of this sort becomes a precedent for action. As far as we are informed, there is no

more reason for making this request about the pay corps than there is about every other official of the Government. You might as well introduce a resolution requiring that all heads of departments should transmit to Congress all charges, and all papers or documents relating thereto, against any official of the Government in that department, and have them published by the House as a House document. If the gentleman has something on his mind, if he knows of information that he desires to obtain, why does he not prepare a resolution asking for information on that subject? If he has nothing—

Mr. COVINGTON. I will state frankly to the gentleman that I have or I certainly would not prepare a resolution of this sort.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COVINGTON] yield?

Mr. COVINGTON. I do.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I simply want to ask the gentleman from Illinois in the time of the gentleman from Maryland if this resolution is comprehensive enough to get such information, if it exists?

The gentleman says, "If he knows of any instance or has heard of any instance, why does he not specifically ask for them?" That was substantially the question, was it not?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I ask the gentleman from Illinois if the resolution is not sufficiently comprehensive to cover the information?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; I think it is. Under this resolution we would get a copy of every charge made by anybody at any time in the last six years.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely refers to papers in any way related to any charges or accusations of a criminal nature against any officers in the Pay Corps of the Army since 1905. There are not many instances of that, I think, as the gentleman from Maryland has said. There are very few, I fancy; and if such papers exist, I doubt if the War Department would be put to any serious inconvenience in finding and transmitting such documents.

Mr. MANN. Let me suggest—because I fear the gentleman has not as carefully examined the resolution as he usually examines resolutions—that the resolution provides for the transmission of—

copies of all records, reports, letters, or papers of any description—

That relate to any charges of criminal or other misconduct, and so forth, or that—

relate in any way to absence from duty since January 1, 1905—

And so forth. Every order permitting a man to be furloughed under this would have to be sent back to the House. Every excuse that has been given, although it might be good and it might not be desirable that it should be made public, would have to be sent back to the House and published under this resolution. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] think that would be a good thing to adopt, as here proposed, with reference to all the officials of the Army?

Mr. COVINGTON. If the gentleman from Texas will permit me, I will say to the gentleman that this resolution applies only to leaves of absence. If he will notice the language, he will see that it is limited to those in the service who have been guilty of criminal misconduct, and it will not require the production of the furloughs of officers of the Army in general.

Mr. MANN. But the gentleman is mistaken. Any absence without leave—in that respect I probably was mistaken—is misconduct; and then the resolution requires all papers in relation to any absence to be published, whatever the excuse may have been, no matter whether the excuse may have been found good by the War Department. Possibly this will not affect anything in the Pay Department, but a similar resolution, if this one is passed for the Pay Department, should be passed for any other department of the Government if the gentleman presents a resolution like this.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COVINGTON. I yield first, Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I would like to ask if it is the purpose to require the War Department to send papers to Congress in these cases where charges have been preferred and the officer has been court-martialed and dismissed from the service?

Mr. COVINGTON. No; certainly not.

Mr. WEEKS. Would not the resolution cover such cases as that? And if that is true, would not that comprehend a large amount of documents and testimony?

Mr. COVINGTON. I take it that an officer who has been court-martialed and dismissed is no longer an officer in the service.

Mr. MANN. That does not make any difference. It would cover that.

Mr. WEEKS. It did not seem to me, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. COVINGTON. The resolution restricts it to officers who are in the service at the present time—

Mr. MANN. Not at all. It says: "Since January 1, 1905—"

Mr. COVINGTON. Against whom accusation has been made. Mr. WEEKS. A criminal accusation would be made, and the man would be court-martialed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The resolution says:

Charges or accusations of criminal or other misconduct on the part of any officer or officers of the Pay Department of the Army since January 1, 1905, or which relate in any way to absence from duty since January 1, 1905, of any such officer or officers against whom such charges or accusations have been made.

Does the gentleman mean by that an accusation of absence without leave?

Mr. COVINGTON. I will say to the gentleman—

Mr. RICHARDSON. Suppose a man had been absent and sick, and was able to explain it satisfactorily. Does the gentleman want to get a full record of that?

Mr. COVINGTON. No. It refers only to officers against whom charges of other character have been made.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman's resolution is not specific in that respect.

Mr. COVINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that I have no desire—

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. COVINGTON. I will state that I have no desire to cause a dragnet to be thrown out to bring to the House all sorts of charges affecting the War Department. I have no desire to cast a stigma on the Army of the United States or any of its departments. I take it the War Department will use due discrimination as to what in its judgment comes within the purview of the resolution.

Mr. WEEKS. I think if the gentleman from Maryland will read the resolution he will find that any charges of misconduct preferred against any officer was when he was an officer of the Army. These are preferred when they are officers in the Army. As the gentleman from Nebraska suggested, there may be hundreds of pages of testimony taken in the case of an officer where he has been dismissed. When the charges were made he was an officer in the Army, and under this resolution I submit that it would be necessary to furnish copies of those papers.

Mr. COVINGTON. I do not agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. COVINGTON. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman, in the beginning of the resolution, calls for copies of all records, reports, letters, or papers of any description which, on June 14, 1911, were in or recorded in any bureau or office of the War Department, or were in the custody of any civil or military officer or employee. I want to submit to the gentleman if he does not think those words, "or in the custody of any civil or military officer or employee," should be stricken out. That is pretty broad—in the custody of a clerk or messenger, it may be.

Mr. COVINGTON. It relates to the charges.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely, but that calls for something more than that which is of record. What is custody? I suppose an employee had a letter in his pocket—

Mr. COVINGTON. Oh, I take it not.

Mr. CANNON. After all, what is the necessity of those words?

Mr. COVINGTON. The legal construction of the words I think the gentleman from Illinois will recognize as meaning simply those papers which are either in the actual physical custody of the War Department in the sense that they are in the files, or those papers in the physical custody of the employee. The gentleman recognizes that many documents are recorded and many others are not. Letters are filed or are letter-press copies. In all departments there are papers merely filed in pigeonholes; many others are only in the physical custody.

Mr. CANNON. After all, if they are on file they are a part of the record. It seems to me that those words would lead to confusion.

Mr. COVINGTON. I have no objection to modifying the language so that it shall cover only charges of criminal misconduct against those officers now in the Pay Department of the Army, in order to meet the objection of the gentleman from

Massachusetts. I am perfectly willing to restrict it within such limits as will bring the real information to this House that it ought in reason to have.

Mr. CANNON. What is the objection, if the gentleman is advised, if this resolution is made to cover the alleged misconduct of any one officer, to calling directly for the information which is desired?

Mr. COVINGTON. I will state frankly that I had a reason that I do not at this time want to disclose why it is not advisable to call directly for the information. But I am perfectly willing that this language shall be made to cover only those officers of that particular department now in the actual service, as suggested by my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. COOPER. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Maryland yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. COVINGTON. I do.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts made the exact point that I wanted to make, but I want to ask the gentleman from Maryland if he would be willing to strike out the words "other misconduct"? I suggest that for the reason—I do not know what offense the gentleman is aiming at—but if a paymaster of the most exemplary character, unblemished record, should have five or six years ago become intoxicated, never before or since, it would require the publication of that fact to the world. It would be purely useless for any purpose and harmful only for every purpose. Criminal misconduct involves, of course, something that is worth while to investigate.

Mr. COVINGTON. I will state very frankly to the gentleman that I recognize that difficulty. I do appreciate just what the gentleman from Illinois has stated, that there might possibly be transmitted information that would not amount to such misconduct as to subject the officer to dismissal, but, on the other hand, there is, as the gentleman well knows, a difference between that grave misconduct which would subject an officer to court-martial and misconduct which would subject him to punishment in the criminal courts of the country.

So that there is that infirmity of the English language which makes it difficult to reach precisely the cases that are wanted to be reached. I realize that difficulty, I must confess. Gentlemen will realize that there are acts of a grave nature that officers of the Army may be guilty of, but which no criminal court could punish them for.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. COVINGTON. Certainly.

Mr. NORRIS. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that he can defeat and obviate all that difficulty by putting in the resolution the particular thing which he wants to reach or wants to have disclosed. That is, some particular officer or some particular offense or some particular transaction, it seems to me, ought to be named in the resolution.

Mr. COVINGTON. Oh, if the gentleman from Nebraska had heard my statement to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]—

Mr. NORRIS. I heard the statement.

Mr. COVINGTON. I stated that I would not do that, but I would accept the amendment the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] very wisely suggested.

Mr. NORRIS. Did the gentleman disclose to the committee the evidence he has?

Mr. COVINGTON. The gentleman did disclose to the committee.

Mr. NORRIS. So that the committee understood the nature of the accusation?

Mr. COVINGTON. Absolutely. I disclosed to the Committee on Military Affairs, and stated to them—

Mr. NORRIS. Would the disclosure or the proper identification of the official or the offense in the resolution meet the purpose of the resolution?

Mr. COVINGTON. I am not sure about that.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that would be the only excuse, the only reason, why it should not be done, because the gentleman must admit that—

Mr. COVINGTON. I am not sure whether it would or not.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman must admit that in making this kind of a charge to the people who must pass upon it he should offer some definite matter.

Mr. COVINGTON. I will assume the responsibility for stating that when that resolution gets to the chief of the Pay Department of the Army he will be able to transmit with sufficient accuracy the information that is wanted, when it is limited as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] has suggested.

Mr. NORRIS. I have never before in my brief experience—at least I can not call it to recollection now—known of an instance where the House has passed a resolution that was reported simply on the statement of a Member that he does not want to disclose the real object and purpose of the resolution.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COVINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Your inquiry is limited to accusations of a criminal nature.

Mr. COVINGTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. No; it is not limited to that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then you follow that with the vague expression, "Or other misconduct." What do you mean by "other misconduct"? What do you want to inquire into?

Mr. COVINGTON. I just stated to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] that in the military service there may be serious derelictions of duty, derelictions of duty which, if the War Department had not recognized them, should subject it to criticism.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Surely.

Mr. COVINGTON. Now, those derelictions of duty may be of a serious character, but they may be not such as would warrant punishment in the criminal courts of the land.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Are they of such importance that a vast record ought to be brought from the War Department from 1905 for investigation?

Mr. COVINGTON. How many instances does the gentleman suppose in the Pay Corps of the Army there have been in the last six years where records of moral shortcomings, even if you put the language that broad, have taken place? I hope not more than one or two.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The gentleman would include in "other misconduct," the mere fact that an officer had been absent, we will say.

Mr. COVINGTON. It does not say so.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The resolution, at its conclusion, says: And which relates in any way to charges or accusations of criminal or other misconduct on the part of any officer or officers, etc.

Mr. COVINGTON. It only provides for those instances where the officers have been guilty of misconduct and have also been treated most courteously and considerately by being given long leaves of absence. It refers only to those officers.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield again? I would like to suggest to the gentleman that if he has fear that the publication at the present time of the information that he bases his belief on that this resolution ought to pass is of such a nature that it would defeat the purposes of the resolution, that the House should perhaps go into executive session and—

Mr. COVINGTON. Oh, I would not ask that.

Mr. NORRIS. The gentleman, on the other hand, ought not, it seems to me, expect the House to pass a resolution here to establish a precedent of taking official action on a statement where the person who gives the information refuses to disclose what is the object of the resolution or its purpose. Now, if it were just a simple thing, if the gentleman will permit me for a moment, if it were just one item, one person, one offense, or one year or one month, it would be a different proposition, but this covers six years, and the words "other misconduct," it seems to me, would bring here, if the resolution were complied with literally, every complaint, every reprimand or correction that was ever made in the Pay Department of the Army for the last six years against any person or any officer or any official.

I do not know how many there would be, but does not the gentleman think something of that kind occurs daily—some little correction that nobody cares anything about? This resolution, if it were complied with, would bring that all in here, and we are to do all that without having any evidence disclosed here, either on the floor or from the report of the committee, that there has been any misconduct of any person. It seems to me it is asking us to do more than the gentleman ought to expect us to do; besides it would be a dangerous precedent.

Mr. COVINGTON. Well, I will simply say to the gentleman that we vote a great many times in this House on faith. Mr. Speaker, I have made all the explanation I care to make about this, and I shall now state that I will accept the addition of the proviso attached to the resolution suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS]. It reads:

Provided, That this resolution shall only apply to those persons who are at the present time commissioned officers in the Army.

The SPEAKER. That would have to be put in the shape of an amendment. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SWEET] has the floor.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask if the gentleman from Michigan will yield a few minutes to me?

Mr. SWEET. I will.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. SWEET. Five minutes.

Mr. KAHN. That will be ample.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Michigan when this resolution was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. SWEET. This morning.

Mr. KAHN. Was there a meeting of this committee this morning?

Mr. SWEET. Yes.

Mr. KAHN. I received no notice whatever of that meeting.

Mr. HAY. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I will state that the committee was called by the chairman and notices were issued, and a very special effort was made to get the gentleman from California, who was phoned at his office at least three times.

Mr. KAHN. I was not at my office, and my mail is sent to my hotel the first thing in the morning. There was no notice of this meeting in my mail.

Mr. HAY. Well, I do not suppose the gentleman means to say that no notice of this meeting was given.

Mr. KAHN. No; I do not. I simply say that notice of this meeting has not reached me. We have had no meeting of the committee for several days, and therefore when I did not receive a notice of the meeting I did not know the meeting was to be had. But there is no desire on my part at any time to oppose a resolution for a proper inquiry. I have no desire to shield or protect any officer charged with any criminal offense. This resolution, as has been stated several times on this side, is exceedingly broad. It is a sort of a dragnet resolution to take in everything and everybody. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COVINGTON] is rather disingenuous. He says that things should not be covered up; if men have charges brought against them, even though those charges be proved false, they should not be put away in the files of the War Department and allowed to stay there.

He thinks the country has a right to know something about the charges. Now, the gentleman ought to be equally frank with this House. He ought not to cover up anything. He ought to say frankly to the House that there is such and such a charge pending against such and such an officer, and that he wants the papers in that case, and then we would procure the papers for him. But to go out in the broad way contemplated by the resolution and try to bring out charges that may have amounted to nothing and have them spread before the country seems to me entirely improper, and I hope the resolution, on that account, will not pass.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SWEET] yield to me for five minutes?

Mr. SWEET. Yes.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised at the attitude taken by the gentlemen on the other side. Resolutions of this character have been passed time and time again in this House, and if there are any charges against any officer of the Pay Department of a criminal nature or any misconduct of so grave a character that it merits the investigation of this House, what objection is there to this resolution, calling upon the Secretary of War for information? Why this anxiety to defeat a very ordinary and customary resolution?

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. MANN. During my 14 years of service in the House I have never seen a resolution of inquiry offered which was so broad as this one, I think. Does the gentleman recall any?

Mr. HAY. I do not know that I can point out any specific resolution that has been offered during my time of service here, but I do know that resolutions of inquiry as broad as this are and have been constantly before this House, and have been passed by the House. This is not such a broad resolution. How many officers are in the Pay Department of the War Department? Not over 100. And there is no doubt about the fact that if this resolution is passed no man is going to be injured by it who ought not to be injured. I venture to say that there is not an officer in the Pay Department who would be opposed to the passage of this resolution on the ground that there might be some charges pending in the War Department against him. If charges are pending against him, what objection is there to the country knowing what charges are pending? When has it become the rule that these charges, if such there be, are to be buried in the pigeonholes of the War Department? If charges are of such a character as to call for a court martial,

those charges are made public; and if some man, through the favoritism of high officials in this Government, has been able to escape justice, has been guilty of crime and misconduct, is it for this House to cover that up?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky). Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAY. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman what objection can there possibly be to putting into this resolution—like, I think, is the universal custom—the specific, particular case you want to get the evidence on?

Mr. HAY. Can the gentleman specify any resolution where that has been done?

Mr. NORRIS. I never knew a resolution where it has not been done.

Mr. HAY. Will the gentleman specify a resolution?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not recall now, but if the gentleman will cite me to a case of any resolution of inquiry, that will be an instance of it. I do not believe there has been an exception in all the time I have been here.

Mr. HAY. I do not believe there has been any resolution of this character where the individual has been named; and if the gentleman can cite me such a resolution, I would be glad if he would do it.

Mr. NORRIS. You can get every resolution of inquiry that ever was passed, and you will get an illustration in every one of them.

Now, I want to ask the gentleman another question. Does not the gentleman think that the words "or other misconduct" will include even a reprimand or disagreement between officials as to whether some official had done something that technically was wrong? I am not objecting to getting the information, but it seems to me it involves almost an infinite amount of work, and unnecessary work on unnecessary subjects.

Mr. HAY. The gentleman seems to think that the officers of the Pay Department are constantly guilty of misconduct, and that there are large and numerous records in the Pay Department showing that. It is not the case at all. The officers of the Pay Department, like the officers of the Army generally, as a class, are not guilty of misconduct.

Mr. NORRIS. I presume that is true; but this covers six years, and with the words "other misconduct," if an official has done anything—it does not make any difference what—to some other official that was not right, or that was even claimed to be wrong, it would be included in this resolution. I take it the gentleman does not want to do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. HAY. Nor does the resolution assume anything of the kind.

Mr. NORRIS. What is the use, then, of including these words, "other misconduct"?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes more to the gentleman from Virginia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Virginia is extended two minutes.

Mr. HAY. I simply wanted to say, in answer to the gentleman from Nebraska, that this resolution does not contemplate that there shall be returned to the House the records of every officer in the Pay Department as to whom there may be some suggestion that he has been guilty of negligence or something of that kind.

It contemplates misconduct, and "misconduct" is no uncertain word. It has a clear and distinct meaning, and it seems to me very strange that gentlemen on the other side should undertake to oppose this resolution.

What objection can there be to having the criminal action and the misconduct of officers of the Pay Department or any other department shown to this House and to the country? I hope the resolution will pass; and if the gentleman from Massachusetts insists upon his amendment—which I do not think helps it at all, because when the resolution says "officers of the Pay Department" it means, of course, those who are now in the Pay Department—but if he desires to have that amendment adopted, I hope the gentleman from Michigan in charge of the resolution will accept the amendment, and that we can now have a vote.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, perhaps enough has already been said on this question, but I want simply to remark that although I can not approach this subject, and did not in the committee approach it, from the standpoint of long experience in this body as a Representative in this House, I felt that the

resolution was in the direction of obtaining for this body information which we are entitled to have and which the people want us to have.

It does not seem to me that the resolution is open to the objections suggested. When the House under that resolution makes its demand on the War Department, I doubt if there will be any tendency on the part of the War Department to extend the language of the resolution so as to make it come down, as the gentlemen seem to fear, to matters of trivial consequence. On the other hand, if there is any straining of the language used in this resolution, it is more likely to be in the opposite direction.

I feel that the people of the country, from the investigations that have already been made, are in a temper where they would prefer to have every department, especially where accusations are suggested, investigated by this body, and I feel that the resolution which has been offered here by the gentleman from Maryland is one that all the Members, regardless of politics, ought to vote for, and one that every honest officer in the Army ought to be glad to have considered.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SWEET. Yes.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman from Virginia asked for one reason why this should be denied. I have one. It may not be important, but it was stated that there were a hundred men in the Pay Corps of the War Department. I do not know any of them. This resolution covers a period of six years. It is a charge against one man or a hundred men; I do not know which. Perhaps the majority of the Members of this House do not know. If an order like this be made, it will stand for an indefinite time as an implied charge against every man in that corps, because it does not fix the period of time in which this demand may be made. This will go to the public, and the public will understand that it means this paymaster or any one of 99 others in that department, and so it seems to me that it ought to be limited and a straightforward statement should be made as to whom it is directed against. If there are papers there against any man, let us know it and let the public know it, in order that direct action may be taken and no implied charge of dishonesty may stand for an indefinite time against a large majority of that department, upon whom this resolution, if passed, will cast a shadow for an indefinite time.

Your resolution does not say within what time this may be transmitted, and the public will wait for an indefinite time to find out who are the men who have charges against them and who have not. It amounts to an aspersion against more than one—against practically everyone in that whole department of the service.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. SWEET. For a question?

Mr. HELM. Will the gentleman yield for a statement of about two minutes?

Mr. SWEET. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HELM. Mr. Speaker, this resolution seems to me to have developed the kind of situation which led to the adoption by the House of that rule which resulted in the appointment of the several standing committees on the investigations of the different departments of the Government. The Committee on Expenditures in the War Department has jurisdiction—

Mr. SWEET. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this involves no expenditure whatever.

Mr. HELM. This committee is not limited only to expenditures in that department, but, among other subjects, to the proper application of public moneys by officers in the Army—the accountability of officers in the Army; so that it seems to me that, instead of passing this resolution in its present form, if anyone possesses any information touching the misconduct of any officer in the Army, and it appears that this resolution touches more immediately upon the Pay Department of the Army, this committee, which is now actively at work, is the proper committee to deal with this matter instead of putting out this dragnet, as it has been deemed proper to term it. And I desire to say that it is not my purpose in rising to shield or defend any man, but more for the purpose of directing the attention of the House to the fact that the proper committee to handle such matter is the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department, which has been vested with the authority to perform just such work as this resolution calls for.

Mr. SWEET. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the remarks of the gentleman I should like to say that the committees to which he refers have been appointed for the purpose of investigating the expenditure of moneys appropriated by this body for the support of the various departments. Now, if, as a result of

accusations of a criminal character, it should appear that some officer in the pay department had been guilty of that kind of misconduct relating to money, the committees investigating expenditures in the various departments would not have jurisdiction of that. Therefore the Committee on Military Affairs, after giving the matter full consideration, and after sending out the proper notices, in an effort to get a full attendance, have unanimously reported in favor of the adoption of this resolution. We believe it will result in good.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SWEET. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. NORRIS. As I understand it, the committee, which the gentleman says gave this matter full consideration, had in mind some one particular case, did it not? The matter was explained to the committee, as I understand it.

Mr. SWEET. It was not necessarily limited to one case.

Mr. NORRIS. Was there more than one?

Mr. SWEET. It was not necessarily limited to one case.

Mr. NORRIS. Was there evidence before the committee of misconduct applying generally to this department of the service?

Mr. SWEET. We have reason to believe that it embraces more than one case.

Mr. NORRIS. Was there any reason why, under the evidence given before the committee, a resolution could not be so drawn as to apply to the particular cases concerning which information is desired?

Mr. SWEET. We so considered; yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Then why was the resolution drawn in this form?

Mr. SWEET. I now demand the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan demands the previous question.

The question being taken, the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is upon agreeing to the resolution—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Is there not an amendment?

Mr. SWEET. It has not been offered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no amendment pending.

Mr. WEEKS. I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COVINGTON] said he would offer it.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. He said he was willing to offer it, but it has not been offered.

Mr. SWEET. It was not offered at the proper time, and it is too late to offer it.

Mr. HAY. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] may be considered as pending and as coming under the order for the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Unanimous consent is asked that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts may be considered as having been offered in time and now considered.

Mr. NORRIS. Reserving the right to object to that, I want to ask the gentleman whether he would be willing to allow 5 or 10 minutes' debate on that amendment?

Mr. HAY. I would not.

Mr. NORRIS. Then I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MANN) there were—ayes 55, noes 29.

So the resolution was agreed to.

NATIONAL BUDGET.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent of the House to print in the RECORD some remarks made by me at a meeting of the Accountants of America, held recently in Washington, on the subject of a National Budget. I do not feel like taking the time of the House to deliver here these remarks, but I would like to have them brought to the attention of the membership of the House.

Mr. MANN. I shall not object, although I think perhaps I ought to and require the gentleman to deliver them in the House, because I think it would be of value to the Members of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"Mr. SHERLEY: Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I once said that in the House of Representatives a little law went further than in any other place on earth, and, being a lawyer, felt that I could so testify. Perhaps, in one sense, a little of any knowledge goes a long way there. At least, a man is not always called to immediate account, because we have much of speech making that does not affect legislation. But appearing to-day before a society of experts, particularly when I am introduced as one in accord with the views of those experts, I have some timidity and trepidation, even though speaking has been somewhat my lot for several years past.

"I have, unfortunately, a subject much too big for anyone to cover in a single address. I am not going to talk to you about budgets generally, but rather narrow my subject to the legislative side of budgets as it applies to the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Government is a matter of evolution, and probably the cause of more failures to reform methods of doing business in government—city, State, or National—is the fact that the man proposing the reform faces it from the outside rather than from the inside. Governments, like men, are always narrowed and restricted by habits—personal habits, if I may be pardoned for such a use of the word—habits that restrict their activity and their initiative just as it does every single individual; and when you undertake, without regard to those habits, to put upon a government any new method, the inevitable result is a failure. I remember talking just a couple of days ago to a gentleman of wide experience with our Government, and he recalled to my mind the very great expense that was incurred by the Government in undertaking a reform in the Public Printing Office, a reform that, on paper, ought to have worked splendidly, and yet the result of which was the expenditure of about \$100,000 and now the daily discarding of the method that had been superimposed upon that establishment, simply because the men who undertook it had no real knowledge of the life history of that institution and the evolution of it. Therefore, their methods were not adaptable and could not be successful.

"I have never known a fundamental change proposed in the procedure of the Congress of the United States that ever was adopted permanently or that during its short trial proved successful. You constantly hear reference to the English method of doing things, or the French method. In the recent debate during the contest over the power of the Speaker of the House of Representatives constant allusion was made to the fact that the English speaker was simply a presiding officer, and that the American Speaker should be made into simply a presiding officer. Now, that may be theoretically an ideal system, and yet one of the characteristics of American political life from the very inception of this Government has been that the speakers of legislative bodies have been leaders of the dominant party in control of legislation of the House, and to ignore that fact and to undertake to abolish it overnight was to ignore the life history of American governmental development.

"Before I touch directly on the question that I want to present to you of proposed reform I want to deal just for a moment with what might be called the executive side of the American budget. And even before I touch on that let me suggest this curious fact to you: In American political life everywhere, except in the Congress of the United States, there is a marked tendency toward concentration of power, with corresponding responsibility. For instance, you gentlemen who deal largely with city government know the tremendous strides that have been made toward the commission form of government; and where even the commission form of government has not been taken up, the mayor of the city has been given supreme power over the boards, power over appointments, power of removal; and, given this large power, he is held to a direct responsibility, the reason for it being that the people have neither the time, the inclination, nor, in a sense, the technical knowledge to enable them to follow details, but are looking to general results. And so they have insisted on giving to one or a limited number of men full power, and making them responsible. And yet the fight that has just taken place in the House of Representatives was a fight not to concentrate power and make responsibility as a result of it, but was to deprive the Speaker of power and diffuse that power among the Members generally. It is a rather curious fact that with that marked tendency everywhere else, in the House of Representatives there should have come the demand that power should be taken from the Speaker and given to the membership generally. How far that has been a wise change, time alone can tell. I have never been one of those who believed that you necessarily reformed a system by changing the method of

selecting the men who were to administer it; and the reform that took place in the House of Representatives by taking from the Speaker the power of appointing committees and giving it to a committee on committees did not, to my mind, reach the real evil, which was not the power in one man to appoint committees, but the power in the committees after appointment to stifle and control legislation in that body. And the remedy, in my judgment, lay in changing the power of the committees rather than changing the authority from which they sprang.

"Now, in regard to the executive side of the budget. Of course, you gentlemen are familiar with the fact that America differs very much in its political arrangement from the English Government, and, indeed, from most of the European Governments. The theory of the makers of the Constitution was a separation of the executive, legislative, and judicial departments—a separation that has continued and must continue without a radical fundamental change in our Constitution. That makes impossible of consideration, or at least unnecessary of consideration, the many propositions that are presented of budgets in countries where the ministry is the government and where they present the budget in the legislature and their failure to successfully carry it through means a change of party or an appeal to the people. Here the Executive presents a budget that may come to a majority in a Congress that is friendly, or may come to a majority that is hostile; and therefore it is impossible to bring about that same degree of responsibility to the makers of the budget that they have in England and in some other countries. We have provided by law that the Secretary of the Treasury shall receive from the other heads of the departments the estimates for the ensuing fiscal year, these estimates to be submitted to him by the 15th of October, and by him submitted to Congress upon its opening in December of each year. It is made his duty to assemble them and to present them to the Congress in the form that has been usual in presentation of the estimates of the various departments. And if they are submitted to him in a form other than that in which they have heretofore been submitted, it is his duty to put them in the proper form, leaving to a footnote any suggested change in form. Within the last two years we have required of him also that he should estimate the revenues for the ensuing year and the probable appropriations necessary for the maintenance of the Government; and if it was found that the appropriations should exceed the estimated revenues, then he should certify that fact to the President of the United States, that the President, in communicating to Congress, might inform it how the appropriation could either be curtailed or the revenue increased. That change, brought about by a provision put upon one of the supply bills, has worked very well recently. But it does not, to my mind, go as far as it should. The President has shown a very commendable zeal in trying to cut down the estimates that are annually submitted to Congress, and he has undertaken to carefully examine the estimates of the various departments and has reported to Congress, through the Secretary of the Treasury, very large reductions in estimates over those originally submitted.

"But, to my mind, what ought to be done is to require that the Secretary of the Treasury shall revise the estimates of every other department of the Government. It is unnecessary to state to you gentlemen, who are so familiar with the subject, that the estimates come from the various members of the Cabinet—from the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, the Postmaster General, the Department of Justice, and so on. As it is now, there is no member of the Cabinet who has any power of revision over the estimates that are submitted by other members of the Cabinet. The Secretary of the Treasury in this regard is simply no more than a clerk to gather together and present in book form to the Congress these various estimates. John Sherman, one of the very greatest of the Secretaries of the Treasury that this country ever had, undertook to get the power to supervise the estimates of the other members of the Cabinet. But naturally everyone of the other Secretaries objected to having a veto power given to anyone else over the budget that he presented. And so the matter failed. But Congress could well afford to give to one member of the Cabinet not only the power but to make it his duty to revise these estimates. And the reason of that would be this: You would then compel a certain consideration by the executive department of the budget as a whole. There is a tendency for each Secretary to consider the needs of his department only; and not unusually the sum total of the estimates to be submitted is found not by any consideration of the Government's power to raise revenue, not by any consideration of the relative merits of this department's demands as against that department's demands, but simply by the opinion that the head of each department has of its needs and then a sum in addition. And so I

believe that one of the reforms that should be had and that could be had without in any way changing the present form of government would be to empower and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to revise the estimates. Of course we can not require the President. We can simply do as we did in this instance that I speak of, require the Secretary to communicate to the President that the President may, in turn, inform Congress. But the fatal mistake in the provision enacted was that it required the Secretary of the Treasury only to inform the President when he found the estimated revenues to be less than the estimated appropriations for the ensuing year. Now, the reason for it exists just as much in a case where the revenues of the country may be sufficient to meet the ordinary expenses as it does where we are likely to have a deficit in the revenues. And unless the duty is imposed upon him you will not have other than through the initiative of some Executive desirous of bringing about reform that supervision and consideration of the different items that go to make up the budget. We have in other particulars followed what seems to be a very good plan. The beginning of the fiscal year is near enough to the time when the estimates are submitted and near enough to the period at which those estimates are likely to have been enacted into law to bring about as much accuracy as possible in dealing with the future. In that particular I think that the American system is all that it should be. We have also passed very stringent laws in regard to the creation of deficits, and have done much to require the keeping within the year of the expenses of the departments and not to permit the borrowing from a future year for the expenses of a current year, so as to enable the Government and the legislative branch of it to know without serious difficulty what the appropriations for a particular year happen to be.

"And now, with that very cursory and loose statement as to the executive side of the budget, I desire to talk to you of the House of Representatives relative to the preparation and consideration of a budget.

"Up until the Civil War the Committee on Ways and Means had jurisdiction over both the levying of taxes and the appropriation of the revenues. It very properly, from the standpoint of theory, had charge of those two highest functions of government, the levying of taxes and the spending of money raised as a result of the levy. But in 1865, largely on account of the tremendous labors that were being imposed upon that committee, a division took place and there was created the Committee on Appropriations, and given to it exclusive power over the appropriation bills, leaving to the Ways and Means Committee the power it now has of exclusively considering the revenue bills. In this country it has been supposed by some people that there was not that same need for having a central authority over matters of raising revenue and matters of expenditure that existed in other countries. To my mind that is a mistake. It has been true, and probably will be true for many years, that Congress will levy taxes frequently for purposes and reasons other than the raising of revenue. But it ought to be true that somewhere in a legislative body there should be some central authority to consider the levying of taxes and the raising of revenue in connection with the appropriation of moneys for the maintenance of the Government. Nothing is stronger evidence of a bad system of government than the piling up either of huge surpluses, that are a constant invitation to extravagance, or the failure to provide sufficient revenues to meet the ordinary and necessary expenses of the Government. And to properly prevent that, there must be cooperation somewhere between that power that first formulates the bill to levy the taxes and that power that first formulates the bill disposing of the money so raised. But we have not only separated these two functions of raising revenue and of disbursing revenue, but in 1880 we took from the Committee on Appropriations control over the Agriculture appropriation bill; and that was followed in 1885 by taking from them control over the appropriation bills relative to the Army, the Navy, Indian affairs, foreign affairs, and rivers and harbors; so that to-day the Committee on Appropriations has control of 6 out of the 14 supply bills, and you have seven or eight different roads to the Treasury; and as Mr. Tawney, the former chairman of the Appropriations Committee, very happily said, 'As many byways as there are members of these appropriating committees.' The result of that has been that there is not now any consideration in Congress of the appropriations as a whole. No man knows what the Sixty-second Congress will appropriate, or, rather, what one session of the Sixty-second Congress will appropriate, until that session has passed into history and he has added up the appropriations that have been made. Now, a more indefensible system can hardly be imagined, that a great Government appropriating, as we do, two thousand millions of dollars during the life of each Congress—at least we have for

the past four years, and from all indications will continue to do so—that a Government appropriating two billions of dollars should not know until it goes through the addition of the various sums appropriated what the total is going to be, is a proposition that to my mind is absolutely indefensible. [Applause.]

"Now, what is the remedy? There are those who dream that we are going to turn back and give to the Committee on Appropriations the entire control over the appropriation bills. Theoretically that might be wise, but to my mind there is no more probability of the Committee on Appropriations ever getting control over all of the supply bills than there is of any other reversion to outworn conditions in this country. The Members of the House of Representatives are compelled through political exigency into personal activity, a personal activity the lack of which means political extinction. The result is that you will never get, at least not for many years, until public opinion has much changed, that condition of service in the House of Representatives that you have in the Parliament of England, where the average member of Parliament only attends when there is some vote or division of primary importance. He takes no part in the preparation or the discussion of the budget, but leaves to the leaders the consideration entirely of the budget and the other great matters of legislation. That can not happen in this country. The man who here would be content simply to vote, whether justly or unjustly, would be condemned by his constituents as a man lacking in real energy or force in the House of Representatives. The result is that there is a constant pressure of interest on every Member in the House to have some part and some voice in, something to say, something to do with, the daily affairs of the House. Now, that in some ways is a good thing; in some ways it is anything but a good thing. That being true, you are not going to get the present committees that have appropriating power to surrender that power and give it into the hands of one committee. Nearly every man to-day who is a member of an appropriating committee in the House, other than the Committee on Appropriations, is jealous of and fighting that Committee on Appropriations, because he claims that it is constantly reaching out and seeking to get back the old power it had of control over all appropriations. And that being true, it being to my mind impossible from a political and practical standpoint to bring about again the concentration of power in the hands of one committee, and because the detail work is now beyond the capacity of that one committee, I have offered an amendment to the rules of the House that I hope may have in it the seed of a reform we all admit ought to be brought about.

"In substance it is this: That there shall be created a new committee called, if you please, a committee on the budget, or on receipts and expenditures. That committee shall be composed of the chief members of the Ways and Means Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the chairmen and ranking minority member of every other appropriating committee. Now, what has been attempted in its personnel was this: To give to the members of the Ways and Means Committee and of the Appropriations Committee sufficient numerical strength to prevent the chairmen of the other appropriating committees from combining and so controlling the budget that should be presented to Congress, and for this reason—it follows inevitably and without regard to personnel—that the men who represent simply one department and appropriate for one department, become in course of time the champions instead of the critics of that department. In our system of government it is highly important that the legislative body should be the critic of the executive body, not the unfair critic, but still, when the estimates are submitted to the House through the Secretary of the Treasury, the House in its consideration should be free to criticize, amend, reduce, and curtail. But when you give to one committee simply jurisdiction over that part of the budget that relates to one department its members inevitably come into such relationship with the executive of that department, particularly if those of the majority happen to belong to the same political party that the executive branch of the Government represents, that they become his champion. And so you find that the chairman and members of the Committee on Military Affairs are fighting to increase their dominion and power by increasing the power and dominion of the Army of the United States. And the chairman and members of the Committee on Naval Affairs are doing the same thing for the Navy; the chairman and members of the Committee on Post Offices for post offices. And as a result, in the life of the past Congress, the material saving that was made over the estimates submitted by the various departments was made by the Committee on Appropriations and not by any one of the committees appropriating for single departments; not that the personnel of the Appropriations Committee is any better, any more pa-

triotic, or any more intelligent, but through the duties that are imposed upon them they have to take a survey of the Government as a whole, and they do not, therefore, become the champions, or rarely do, of any particular department.

"The exact proposal is as follows:

"Resolved, That the following rule be added to the rules of the House, and to be known as section 6 to Rule X:

"Sec. 6. There shall be a Committee on Estimates and Expenditures, whose personnel shall consist of the following members: The chairman and three ranking majority members, and the ranking minority member of the Committees on Ways and Means and Appropriations, and the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committees on Rules, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, the Post Office and Post Roads, Rivers and Harbors, and Indian Affairs. The chairman of said committee shall be selected by the members thereof. Said committee shall, as soon after the convening of each regular session of Congress as may be, report to the House the amount of revenue probably available for appropriation for the next fiscal year, and apportion the amount to the several appropriation bills within the jurisdiction of the committees empowered by the rules and practice of the House to report appropriations from the Treasury. This report, or supplementary reports to meet exigencies of the public service, may be made on any legislative day after the reading of the Journal, and when agreed to by the House shall limit the totals of the appropriations reported by the several committees."

"You see, I provided that the committee should be composed of such ranking members of the Ways and Means, which I believe should be represented as the committee which deals with the levying of taxes; the Committee on Appropriations, and only the chairman and ranking minority member of the other appropriating committees, and the Rules Committee, so that the personnel taken from Ways and Means and Appropriations should equal the personnel taken from these other appropriating committees; that it is made the duty of that committee to submit to Congress at the beginning, or as early thereafter as possible, an entire budget, and to allot the various sums from that budget that can be appropriated for the various departments. In other words, if a budget of a thousand million dollars is brought in, that committee shall then, in presenting it, say that one hundred millions of this goes to the Army, one hundred and twenty-five millions goes to the Navy, one hundred and twenty millions goes to pensions—of course, I am dealing loosely in figures, as you gentlemen will understand—and so on down. And when the report of this committee is adopted by the House it shall be a limitation upon the appropriating power of each of the appropriating committees.

"That, in substance, is the plan, and this is what I hope to accomplish by it: A real consideration by Congress and, as a result of that, a real consideration by the American people of the budget as a whole. Our work in Congress to-day is all sharpshooting. We spend our time in discussing the particular items, fighting this item or that item. Now, that is important work. That is work that I would not eliminate from Congress, but it is not the whole work, and unless you have on the part of Congress a consideration of the budget as a whole, you will neither develop men of broad statesmanship nor will you present to the people any real question of economy in the administration of the Government, or any real issue on which parties ought to be formed and by which you can create party responsibility.

"As it is each bill comes in reported by a particular committee. It is examined with more or less care by the membership of the whole House, according as their particular interests may be in that matter, and it goes through the regular procedure, being first considered in the Committee of the Whole and then reported back to the House, then to the Senate, and from there, through conference and agreement of both Houses, to the President, and then becomes a law. But there are not many men in the House who could tell you the relative size of appropriations for war purposes, for instance, as against peace purposes, or for the machinery of government itself, aside from the actual things it does by that machinery. And yet those are the really important questions. What the people of America want to know about are these great totals. It is absolutely impossible to interest 90,000,000 people in the little details of legislation. But if you could present to them the fact that you have had a growth of nearly 100 per cent in the last 16 years in your appropriations, with only a corresponding growth of a little over 20 per cent in population, you have then a big question, one worthy of the serious consideration of the American people. Under this system the majority party would bring in its budget; the minority party attacks that budget; the majority party makes its record, and at the next election goes to the country and on that record stands or falls. Then you have a real issue and you have real party responsibility.

"One of the reasons that you are seeing the peculiar political condition where insurgency is rife in both parties is because, with the exception of that side of the budget which deals with the levying of taxes, you have had no real issue on which parties are made, and there is nothing that the people can consider.

Now, while the individual legislator is important in government, I believe that you never get the highest results except through party responsibility, by party initiative, and by party criticism. The trouble with parties that the people complain of now vanishes when you have real issues that those parties stand and divide on, and when the people can get genuine relief from one system by taking up the party that advocates a different system. There is nothing of that kind to-day. There is not the slightest consideration of a budget in any true sense of the word; there is no way, unless you drag it in by the heels, whereby a man can properly make a speech on the floor of the House of Representatives dealing with the entire expenditures of the Government of the United States.

"Now, whether this reform can be brought about is a very serious question. I had hoped to present it before the organization of the present House that I might then have had the advantage of not undertaking to curtail the power of any particular man, because after your committees are formed, when you undertake a reform you are immediately confronted with the personal equation, and the personal equation is a very powerful factor in legislation and legislative reforms. But had it been possible to present this plan before the House committee were named, then no man could necessarily have known that his power would be curtailed. It is still my hope that this reform may take place. That it will take place in time I have not the slightest doubt, because it is inconceivable that we should long continue our present method. We have been peculiarly fortunate, we have had a country so wonderfully rich, we have had such unbounded resources that we could always raise revenue sufficient to satisfy even the most extravagant of parties or the most extravagant of administrations. But with budgets that are growing by leaps and bounds, with an annual expenditure of a billion dollars, we are approaching that time, if we have not already reached it, when we have to consider the capacity of the Government to raise money sufficient to pay this tremendous sum annually. And when that question becomes acute, when you have to face not simply the general policy of tariff, or whether you will levy a tax for protection purposes or for revenue purposes, but when you have to consider how you can raise enough money to keep from having a deficit, then you are going to have such a situation as will force a change in the legislative procedure whereby you will have consideration of a budget as a whole.

"Mr. Chairman, of necessity I have talked in a rather desultory way, and I do not know that I have covered the ground, yet there does not occur to me right now any further suggestion. Summarizing my remedy, so far as it is a remedy, it is, first, to make the Executive, through a single Cabinet officer, present a budget that has been considered not only by the individual heads of bureaus, but has been considered in regard to the relation of these totals to each other; and, secondly, the creation in the legislative branch of a committee that in its labors will have to consider the subject as a whole, and in its presentation to the House as a whole will require of it a similar consideration.

"If I have not made myself altogether clear and there is any gentleman who would like to ask any questions, I would be very glad to answer them, because sometimes I find that interrogation brings about clarity of statement very much more than an attempt to speak without interruption. Otherwise, I beg to thank you all for your attention."

THE WOOLEN SCHEDULE.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of bill 11019, to reduce the duties on wool and woolen manufactures.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill 11019.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HAY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill of which the Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11019) to reduce the duties on wool and manufactures of wool.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the experience we have passed through to-day shows it to be true that the less a Member of the House knows about what is going on the more time he consumes. We have wasted nearly four hours in the discussion of two resolutions, and we have wasted those four hours largely because the Members had not an opportunity to

inform themselves about them. It may be that that is the reason why the debate on the wool schedule has lasted so long.

A very distinguished gentleman, a former Member of another body, said at one time that there were not 10 men in the United States who understood the wool schedule, and when one of those gentlemen was taken sick consideration of that schedule had to be postponed.

I do not think that my efforts here this afternoon are going to demonstrate that I am entitled to be admitted to that galaxy of statesmen who are supposed to understand the wool schedule, but there are some things about Schedule K that I do know. It has often seemed to me that that is the best letter in the alphabet to designate that schedule. First, because K is the crooked letter of the alphabet. It stands for knavery and it stands for kite, a vulture that preys upon the people of this country. There are things in Schedule K which no man can fail to find if he gives the subject any study. They stand out like a sore thumb, and I propose to call the attention of the House to one of the worst discriminations which exists in that schedule; and I will claim for my party that, if we have achieved no other result, we will have justified ourselves before the people for the time that we have spent in the preparation and discussion of this bill by wiping out that one discrimination.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] made a very interesting speech the other day with reference to worsteds, one that showed that he had given great study to that particular item of Schedule K. He criticized our side of the House, however, because we had not put worsted cloth upon the free list, and he did not give full credit to us for what we actually did to the gentlemen who have so long been able to control legislation with reference to that schedule. I have made somewhat of a study of that item myself, and it is an interesting subject. I doubt if I shall be able to impart even the little information that I have to the membership of this body this afternoon, but I shall do my best.

Manufacturers of woolen cloth may be divided into two classes, those who manufacture the soft woolen cloth and those who manufacture the hard-finished worsted cloth. I might say, in passing, that the former class is usually found on this side of the aisle and the latter on the other. The manufacturer of woolen cloth of the former class uses first-class wool, and the manufacturer of worsted cloth uses wool of the second class. Section 306 of Schedule K of the Payne law deals with this subject. I do not mean to say that the author of the Payne law is responsible for this situation and this state of affairs, because, so far as I can learn, it has existed since 1867; but the language of that act is so carefully drawn that first-class wool pays, when it comes into this country unwashed, a certain duty, and coming in washed it pays double that duty. While to the ordinary reader it would appear that they were both included in precisely the same category, yet it appears on investigation that second-class wool pays only one duty, whether it comes in washed or unwashed.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt the gentleman there?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. SHARP. Does that not arise from the fact that we have a specific form of duty rather than an ad valorem?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. No; that has not anything to do with this particular fact. It is the language of the law, cleverly and cunningly drawn, presumably at the instance of a man who had something to be gained by legislation that results in this state of affairs. You can read it over and over again, and I venture to say, if no one has called your attention to it, that you will never discover the joker in section 306 of Schedule K. See how smoothly and plainly it reads:

The duty on wools of the first class which shall be imported washed shall be twice the amount of the duty to which they would be subjected if imported unwashed, and the duty on wools of the first and second class which shall be imported scoured shall be, etc.

It thus leaves out of the classification entirely washed wool of the second class. Now, since 1867 men have been legislating with reference to this schedule. This language has been there all that time, and yet there was nobody who had sufficient interest, patriotism, and knowledge all at one time to correct the error. This has resulted very detrimentally to the gentlemen who are engaged in the manufacture of woolen goods which pay the double duty.

Mr. SHARP. May I ask the gentleman another question right there? I do not want to interrupt him continuously.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I have no objection.

Mr. SHARP. I merely ask for information. Does that not also work an injustice to a certain class of woolgrowers in this country?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Oh, undoubtedly it works an injustice to a certain class of woolgrowers in this country, because it gives an advantage to the worsted manufacturer. The worsted manufacturer is the manufacturer who consumes a great deal of foreign wool, and he is the competitor in the market of the woolen manufacturer, who consumes much of our home-grown wool. It gives him a tremendous advantage in more ways than one, and I will try to reach them in their order. In the first place the woolen manufacturer pays this high duty on his raw material, and the woolen weaver must pay that high duty on that raw material as compared with the low duty on the raw material of the worsted manufacturer. This gives him a tremendous advantage, and he has enjoyed that advantage since 1867. In addition to that, worsted wools coming in shrink considerably less than the other wools, so that the amount of duty or the amount of protection that the woolgrower receives depends upon the amount of wool there is left after it is scoured. Thus the worsted man bringing in his raw material has a considerable higher percentage of actual wool left after it is scoured than the man who brings in the other wool.

Mr. SHARP. Does not that illustrate what I sought to get at in my first question, that a specific duty does play an important part, because it has to do with the weight and not the ad valorem?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The specific duty plays a tremendous part all through this schedule.

Mr. SHARP. That is what I thought.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The point I was trying to make was that the language of the act, ostensibly dealing with first and second class wools, dealt with only one class, so that the manufacturer who uses one wool was paying a certain duty and the manufacturer who uses the other had to pay a double duty, giving an advantage to the manufacturer who used the foreign wool to the detriment and great distress of the manufacturer who relies upon the production of our own product. Now, not only was the worsted manufacturer benefited in that respect, paying only one-half the duty that is paid by his brother, the wool manufacturer, but he was also in receipt of a high tariff upon his by-products, because the worsted manufacturer only uses the long threads or hairs of the wool, more suitable for spinning into tight twisted threads than the shorter forms of wool. In combing and laying those threads in a manner suitable for him and proceeding with its manufacture into worsted yarn he removes the short threads and nobs which are part of the raw material of his rival—the woolen manufacturer. Now, then, he receives his raw material at about half what his rival pays, and he is then in a position to sell back to him at more than double that duty the by-product which his rival must use. By a trick he gets the raw material at a low rate and he is permitted to charge this by-product at a rate which is prohibitory. Now, as I said, the worsted spinner when he imports raw material also benefits tremendously by the shrinkage, so that he gets his raw material in at about 15 cents a pound, and he gets 20 to 30 cents per pound on this by-product which must be purchased by his competitor. The present law has remedied all that. It applies a duty of 20 cents per pound—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman, but I would like to ask for information, and I would be very glad if the gentleman will tell me what the percentage of manufactured wool is in the domestic market in this country.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. What the percentage is—

Mr. RICHARDSON. What the percentage of the manufactured wool that is used at home, leaving a certain percentage to come in from foreign countries.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I think we produce, roughly speaking, about 50 per cent of the wool consumed.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Then that leaves an import of about 50 per cent, does it?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I think so; roughly speaking, about that.

Mr. RICHARDSON. But the gentleman is not accurate—

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. No; I do not pretend to be.

Mr. HARDY. I think the last showing was 327,000,000 pounds home production and 252,000,000 pounds, along about that, of foreign wool.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. My recollection is that we produce about half the wool we need in this country. That varies from year to year.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The domestic market consumes about one-half of the manufactured wool, not of the raw wool, but of the manufactured wool, in this country.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I think the domestic market consumes practically all of the manufactured wool. I do not think we export to any great extent.

Mr. SIMS. What do I understand the gentleman to mean by the term "manufactured wool?"

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I think the gentleman from Alabama meant cloth. I misunderstood him.

Mr. SIMS. The gentleman used it.

Mr. RICHARDSON. There is, of course, a difference between manufactured wool and raw wool.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. SIMS. I thought manufactured wool ceases to be raw wool, and I understand is subject to the very highest competition with the world's manufactured wool, is it not?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. At this time?

Mr. RICHARDSON. At this time; right now—1911.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Raw wool is in a competitive condition.

Mr. RICHARDSON. The highest order of competition.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Well, I would not say that. It is competitive now, because we import a lot of wool.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I merely wanted to get the gentleman's idea.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. To show you how this schedule works out, the present law places a duty of 22 cents upon a pound of washed-down clothing wool. "Down" is a word used to designate a particular kind of wool. If that wool comes into this country washed at the present time—the short wool they use for clothing purposes—it pays a duty of 22 cents a pound. If, on the other hand, washed-down wool of the kind possible for the spinner to use, comes into this country, it pays a duty of only 12 cents a pound. The most remarkable thing about this whole wool schedule, it seems to me, is the fact that this has practically escaped the notice and knowledge of Members of the House and Senators who have legislated with reference to it. This is one of the most pronounced jokers in the woolen schedule.

The proposed law puts a duty of 20 per cent on all three classes of wool. There should be no difficulty about collecting that duty. Wool, as a rule, is sold at public auction in the London or Liverpool markets. The duty is collected on the value, and everybody knows precisely what a man pays for a cargo of wool when he buys it in the open market. Twenty per cent of that is collected from him before he is permitted to bring it into these ports. Whether it is washed, unwashed, or scoured, all these discriminations and classifications which it is impossible for the average man, or even for a highly intelligent man, to make anything out of when he is reading the present law have been wiped away. One schedule of the present law will say "that the duty on this item shall be two and one-half times as much as the duty on something else, and then 40 per cent ad valorem"; "the duty on a pound of this shall be half the duty on a pound of something else, and so much added ad valorem." It was intended, it seems to me, in cold blood, when this schedule was first brought into existence, to have it in such shape that it would defy the intelligence of men of ordinary understanding. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The consequence of this situation is that the woolen manufacturer has been driven to a great extent from the field by his worsted rival. The importation of woolen goods has been largely of the woolen class and not of the worsted. Little of that made by the worsted man has come into this country. Of course, there are people in this country who insist on having the imported goods. There are men whom you and I know who insist upon having imported goods, and care little or nothing what the tariff may be, but so far as the ordinary citizen is concerned the worsted cloth that comes into this country does not affect the price of his clothing. The woolen man, consequently, has been ground between the upper and nether millstones of the competition of the worsted man at home and the foreigner abroad, because the worsted man was getting his raw material at practically half of what the woolen weaver was paying and the foreigner was not paying any tax upon his raw material at all. So that, so far as he was concerned, in a schedule which was highly protective they were not willing to be fair and divide with him and give him a part of the plunder. No. It was certain gentlemen who represented certain interests which were influential here who were able to arrange that schedule to the disadvantage of their rivals in business and the American people and reap the profits for themselves. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The yarn spinner is the man who prepares the product of the worsted weaver. He takes that second-class wool which only

pays one duty and spins it into worsted and sells it to the worsted weaver. He receives a shelter of protection to the extent of from 82 to 143 per cent ad valorem equivalent.

Here is another angle from which the joker can be seen. The worsted weaver can not protect himself against the worsted spinner unless he also becomes a worsted spinner, because the worsted spinners are in a position to charge him, by combining together, any percentage of the income of his business that they choose by raising the price of the raw material. So the worsted man is in a very fortunate position. I have a pamphlet issued by the carded-woolen people in which the worsted men are pictured riding in a boy's wagon behind a goat—the woolen man being the goat.

The worsted spinner, the worsted weaver, and the woolen weaver are all at the mercy of the men who produce their raw materials. The worsted weaver, if he is not also a worsted spinner, is probably in a worse position than the manufacturer of woolen goods, because the duty of 82 to 143 per cent makes it absolutely impossible for him to go anywhere else except to the worsted manufacturers of this country for his yarn. Out of all the goods that were imported into this country and all the worsted that is used, there were only 290-odd thousand pounds of yarn of an exceptionally fine grade imported into this country. The worsted spinner has the people and the worsted weaver absolutely at his mercy.

Mr. SHARP. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. SHARP. Inasmuch as the gentleman who has the floor and who is addressing the House hails from the State of New Jersey, I wish to say that during a recent visit that I made to my home, one of the largest retail merchants in my home town, in a conversation regarding the wool tariff, told me—and he is of the opposite political faith, he being a Republican—that in the last few years the price on a certain high grade of cloth had been raised to him about 75 per cent. He referred, I think, to the American Worsteds Co., of the State of New Jersey, and he characterized it as one of the most powerful trusts there was in existence to-day. I would like to ask some information from the gentleman, if he is able to give it, upon the operations of that so-called trust.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Well, we have a lot of mosquitoes in New Jersey, and we have a lot of trusts in New Jersey, and I have some doubts as to which of those two classes of pests is the most numerous. [Laughter.] The existence of a Woolen Trust would not be likely to attract my notice, being an inhabitant of the State of New Jersey, unless it was specifically called to my attention; but I am not sure but that the organization to which the gentleman refers is in my district, and I am a little bit uneasy as to just what effect the speech I am now making will have upon them. [Laughter.]

Now, one of the results of the present law—that is, the present Payne law, which ought to interest the woolgrowers—is this: When the price is high, and on account of the heavy shrinkage, the woolen man finds it difficult to pay for wool produced at home, or on account of the tariff tax and shrinkage to pay for wool produced abroad, being beset at the same time by the competition of the worsted manufacturers, whose product is side by side with his own in every tailor shop in the land, he is compelled to betake himself to substitutes for wool, such as cotton and shoddy. Now, it seems to me that there is something that ought to draw the attention of gentlemen who are supposed to be, and I know are, sincerely interested in the welfare of the wool producers of this country. They are supposed to be receiving 11 cents per pound protection, but really they compete with the light-shrinking wool that finally comes into competition with them, and it transpires that they are receiving a protection of only 6½ cents a pound under the present law. Yet that 11 cents has been dangled out before their eyes, and they conscientiously believe they have been receiving it all these years, and in return for that they have been asked to stand for the robbery and plunder of the balance of the American people at the hands of these manufacturers. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I believe that one effect of this bill will be to increase the consumption of home-grown wool, because it will put the woolen man and the worsted man more on an equality. It will give the woolen man "more of a chance," as the boys say, "for his white alley." There have been many wool factories in this country, the owners of which have been driven into exile and the mills themselves shut down on account of the inequalities and discriminations of this legislation, and yet, strange to say, it is only within a very short time, so far as I can learn, that

they have discovered what was the matter with them and uncovered the inequalities of the law.

Here is a bulletin published by the Carded Wool Manufacturers' Association of Boston, which I wish every Member of this House would procure for himself and read. It is absolutely amazing to think that men of brains and intelligence sufficient to enable them to acquire fortunes and take care of themselves in the ordinary channels of trade and commerce should so long have been abused in this way without actually knowing that it was taking place.

The gentleman from Illinois, my good friend Mr. MANN was discussing the question of shoddy the other day, and he delivered himself of a rather peculiar line of philosophy, I thought, when he objected most strenuously to permitting our own people to be robbed and swindled by the sale of shoddy, but thought it was a good practice for us to carry on those tactics abroad. I will say that I have not investigated and do not know how much shoddy we do use, nor how much percentage per capita, but he left the impression with the House, or at least on my mind, that the reason we were not consuming much shoddy in this country was because we were consuming a tremendous amount of wool and were getting good, warm wool in our clothing instead of shoddy. He proudly pointed out the fact that the soldiers of our country were the only soldiers of any country who were clothed in wool. Well, I happen to know that that statement is partially true, at least it was true in 1893, that the American soldiers were clothed with wool, because they sent us, clothed in heavy woolen suits, down to Jacksonville, Fla., in the middle of the summer; and strangely enough, when cooler weather came, when September and October rolled around, and we were ordered to go North again, they issued to us khaki clothing. [Laughter.]

But I have investigated the figures as to the consumption of wool in this country, and I find that we consume 7.11 pounds per capita annually, while in England, where the condition of the workingman is supposed to be so vastly inferior to our own, I find that they consume 8.91 pounds per capita annually; and those figures are for home consumption entirely. They do not include the amount of wool actually used and exported; for if they did, we would find that as against 7.11 pounds used in America annually per capita the consumption of wool in England is 19.62 pounds, showing conclusively that for some reason or other, despite the tremendous prices that the American people pay for their clothing, they are not getting clothing made of wool. I do not know whether it is made of shoddy or paper or this stuff that they put into the trusts when they overcapitalize them—water. I do not know what it is, but I do know that it is not wool, because the per capita consumption of this country shows that we are not being clothed with wool.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I will be delighted.

Mr. FOWLER. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I should like to ask the gentleman where he gets his figures as to the amount of consumption of woolen products and how he arrives at the figures?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I got the figures of the English consumption from the report of the board of trade of England.

Mr. MANN. I mean in this country.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I must admit that I got that from the report of the Committee on Ways and Means. The gentleman will find in that report that the annual consumption in this country is stated to be 7.11 pounds. I have no doubt the figures are correct.

Mr. MANN. I have seen those figures questioned. That is the reason I ask.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I have made no independent investigation of that.

Mr. HARRISON of New York. Will the gentleman from New Jersey add that the per capita consumption of wool in this country is considerably less than it was 20 years ago?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes; that is true. It is less at this time than it was 20 years ago. I think at some period between then and now it has been greater, but it is less now than it was 20 years ago.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to ask the gentleman if the consumption of wool in America was not the greatest when we had free trade in wool in America?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. That is my recollection; yes.

Mr. FOWLER. I will ask if the last year of the Wilson bill did not show a greater consumption of wool in America than at any other time, previous or subsequent.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PAYNE. The gentleman has not the statistics on that, has he?

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is misinformed.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I think the gentleman from Illinois is correct. I do know that the woolen weaving industry flourished during that period more than at any other time in its history.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to inquire if in 1897, the last year of the Wilson bill, there was not consumed in America 601,000,000 pounds of wool, the greatest year of consumption before or since?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I am not familiar with those figures; I have no doubt they are correct.

Mr. FOWLER. I desire to say that the report on wool from 1840 to 1910 shows that in that year—1897—there were 601,000,000 pounds of wool consumed in America, and in the last year there was 581,000,000 pounds. Now, I desire to ask one more question and then I am done.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. So long as the gentleman does not care whether I answer or not.

Mr. FOWLER. No. The gentleman said that if we could get a reduction on wool we could get good woolen clothes instead of having clothes not made out of wool, and that there had been watered stock put in some companies manufacturing woolen goods, or to that effect. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that they have also put in electricity, which is verified by the rapidity with which they are going down into our pockets and taking our money for shoddy goods? [Laughter.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I am glad that the gentleman does not insist on an answer.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I want, with the permission of the gentleman from New Jersey, to commend the gentleman from Illinois to the study of the report, when he will find that the majority of this wool that he says was consumed was carried over in subsequent years. I think as high as a million pounds was carried over from one year to another. He will find that it was not consumed, although it was imported and dumped in here; it was carried over, and not consumed for some years afterwards.

Mr. FOWLER. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that the statement he is about to put in the Record has been put in, to my knowledge, two different times. The gentleman from Illinois, in his speech, referred to that statement, and I think the committee understands it. There is no doubt about the accuracy of the figures the gentleman has. The question is whether or not the wool was imported for consumption in one year, or whether it was imported and carried over?

Mr. FOWLER. I wanted to ask the gentleman from New York how he accounts for the fact that in 1895 there was 509,000,000 pounds of wool consumed in America—a greater number of pounds than any previous year to that date?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I would suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that any question he desires to ask the gentleman from New York had better be addressed to him when the gentleman from New York makes his speech.

Mr. FOWLER. I beg pardon of the gentleman, because I did not want the gentleman to make a statement that there was wool carried over for that year.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The gentleman from New York is going to address the committee on the subject, and I have no doubt ample opportunity will be given the gentleman from Illinois to discuss that important feature of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, before I leave this branch of the subject I want to call the attention of the committee to the bulletin issued by the carded woolen manufacturers, under date of May 11, and I call attention to this paragraph. It occurs in a letter written by Edward Moir, the president of the Carded Woolen Manufacturers Association, the industry that is so discriminated against in the present legislation. He says:

I desire also to call your attention to the common belief that the prohibitory duties on heavy shrinking wool benefit the American wool-grower by forcing the manufacturer to use American wool. That is a great mistake. There is a well defined and by no means elevated limit to the price the buyer will pay for wool cloth. When that limit is passed the buyer turns to cloth made of mixtures of cotton, wool, and shoddy in order to get the goods at the price desired. The effect of these prohibitory duties on heavy shrinking wool are unmistakable. They benefit the worsted spinner by oppressing his competitor the carded woolen manufacturer. They force the consumers to clothe

themselves with mixtures of cotton, shoddy, and wool. They injure the woolgrower by bringing into disrepute the tariff that should protect him.

The only complete remedy for the inequalities in the duties on wool are ad valorem rates. Such rates are fair to all, woolgrower, worsted spinner, carded-woolen manufacturer, clothier, and consumer. If the present specific tariff were changed to an equivalent ad valorem tariff, the effect would be to raise duties that are now below the average and to lower the duties that are now above the average. In other words, it would be equalization.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to say a few words about a subject which seems to cause great concern to our friends on the other side of the aisle, and that is the effect of this legislation upon the laboring classes of the country. I will say at the outset, if it was proposed in this bill to reduce the tariff to such a point that there would be serious danger of making it impossible for the manufacturer in this country to pay living wages, a desire on the part of anybody to lower the tariff to such an extent that it would be impossible for the American manufacturer to pay living wages to his men, why, then, gentlemen on this or the other side of the House are going to have difficulty in getting me to go along with them.

Mr. MANN. That is what we think.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I do not anticipate any trouble, however, on that score, because I have worked myself in the factories of the country, and I have worked for very low wages, and I do not think that all of the time I was employed in factories in the city of Paterson that I averaged a dollar a day, taking into account the time that I lost. I want to tell you something else. Your campaign book in 1905 published the amount of wages paid to the silk operatives throughout this country and the number of operatives engaged in such industry, and one day, having nothing else to do, I divided one into the other, and I found that, although this industry is protected to the extent of 50 per cent or more ad valorem, the wages received by the operatives in that particular industry amounted to the munificent sum of \$335 per year.

Now, think of it! I will tell you something else when you get to talking about foreign competition with American labor. The fiercest competition that the silk manufacturers in the city of Paterson ever met did not come from abroad. Oh, no; it came from the State of Pennsylvania, where these gentlemen come from who are inveighing against a revision of the tariff for fear of injuring the laboring man. The situation existing up there in Pennsylvania was absolutely ideal for their purposes. Why, there the big, brawny men were working in the mines and the little boys were picking slate out of the coal as it shot down the chutes. Oh, I have seen them with their hands bleeding—little fellows who ought to be at home being attended to and taken care of by their mothers—I have seen them with their nails bleeding from the constant impact against the sharp corners of the slate. The men were employed and the boys were employed. There remained only to find some way of employing the infant girls. Suddenly some genius thought of the silk business—that was the thing. They came to my town and they enlisted the services of the manufacturers and showed them what a world of cheap labor there was to be had—a part of the miner's family which was not now being used. They induced the manufacturers to go up there; they built them their factories for nothing; they gave them coal at \$1 a ton the year around; they remitted their taxes for 10 and 15 years; and they put these little girls to work. Took them out of the fields and off the hills, away from the schools, the prettiest and nicest little girls a man ever looked at. I have seen them up there, red cheeked, healthy, happy-eyed children, doomed for the future to pass their lives within the four brick walls of the silk mills of Pennsylvania. I saw them there working, and I saw the pay rolls.

I saw girls doing work in one mill in the State of Pennsylvania for \$4 a week, and the scale in the city of Paterson then being paid was from \$15 to \$21. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Now I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Do you think that removing the tariff would be a benefit or better the condition of the laboring men in this country?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. My dear sir, I am coming to that in a moment, because I have been under the impression always, and I am still under the impression, that the tariff has nothing to do with wages [applause on the Democratic side], as the gentleman from Wisconsin very well said yesterday.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. And state, if you please, if there is any country that the sun shines on when it goes from east to west around this globe where the laboring man is so well fed, clothed, so well paid, and so happy as in the United States of America. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The gentleman can get time to make his speech. I have heard that statement so often it makes me tired. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. The truth generally hurts—

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am not prepared to say now there is any country where the condition of the laboring man is better than it is here, for, unfortunately, his condition is bad in a great many countries; but I will say, just as did the gentleman from Wisconsin on yesterday, that the wages and condition of workmen are fixed by a great many different contributory circumstances; and as he justly said, and as the father of HENRY GEORGE said before him, the land values in this country are one of the controlling things in fixing the wages in this country. So long as there are free lands here, so long as the price of agricultural labor is high, all labor will be high. The iron law of wages, of which Adam Smith speaks, arranges it so that a man will get enough to carry him into the mill the next day strong, vigorous, and able to give an entire day's work to his employer; the very law of wages fixes that in every corner of the globe. But you take the stand that you are doing something for the American laboring man when you enable his employer to plunder the people. You say to him, "I will give you part of the plunder," but he does not get it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I do not deny that the protective tariff, if carried to its logical conclusion—a combination or monopoly formed to take advantage of it—I do not deny that that will enable these gentlemen to pay high wages. But it does not compel them to pay those wages. If the billion or nearly dollars' worth of watered stock of the Steel Trust, that it now compels us to pay dividends on, had not been issued and that money was in the treasury of that company instead of going out in dividends on that watered stock, why of course they could pay tremendously high wages. I say while it enables them to pay high wages it does not compel them to pay high wages. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SLOAN. I would like to ask the gentleman if he indorses the taxation system of either HENRY GEORGE, or his distinguished father?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I do not know if the gentleman has ever read any of the articles—

Mr. SLOAN. I think I have read nearly all those of the elder and have heard some of the speeches of HENRY GEORGE, JR.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me, I find it very difficult indeed to disagree with the elder Mr. George.

Mr. SLOAN. Do you agree with him?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. To a large extent I do.

Mr. SLOAN. Does the gentleman's party agree with him?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Oh, I am not speaking for my party.

Mr. HARDY. What has that to do with this question.

Mr. SLOAN. HENRY GEORGE and HENRY GEORGE'S father are noted for distinctive ideas on taxation—

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I suppose the gentleman is referring now to the single tax?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. And I want to limit my answer to that.

Mr. SLOAN. More particularly that.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. And so I say I find it very hard indeed to escape the conclusions drawn by Mr. George in such of his works as I have read.

I never heard a joint discussion between a single-taxer and a man opposed to the idea. There may be a good many arguments to be made on the other side of the proposition with which I am not familiar and which might affect my mind. But I must say that he seemed, so far as I have been able to observe, to make it very difficult, indeed, for a fair-minded man, with no preconceived convictions on the subject, to disagree with him.

Mr. SIMS. In the city of Washington we have the single tax where Congress legislates only, and intangible property, such as stocks, bonds, or anything of that sort, goes scot free. You want a single tax where Congress makes all the laws you have.

Mr. SLOAN. Do you want it in Tennessee?

Mr. SIMS. If I was like some of these millionaires here, with my property in bonds and stocks, I would want it here and be scot free of taxation.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I want to assure the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, that so far as I have been able to gather from my investigation of the subject, nobody has claimed that the labor cost of any of the articles contained in the different items of this schedule in any case exceeds 25 per

cent. So that we are levying upon every item more than the amount of the total labor cost involved. Now, if gentlemen are fair and candid, they ought to stop talking about the inability of the American manufacturer to pay American wages, when in addition to the wages he does pay before he can bring his goods into the ports of this country he must pay a sum which is more than equivalent to the total labor cost of the article. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The wages paid in the woolen industry will stand examination, and the figures of the last census show—not the figures under the present census, which I think will show an increase, but the figures of the last census—that the average wages received in the woolen industry are \$364 a year. Now, right at that point I want to read you—

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the average duty on wool and woolen goods?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. The average duty is about 92 per cent, I think.

There is a pamphlet here headed, "The wool manufacture in America and Europe."

This company is in my district, at Passaic, N. J. Mr. Forsman is former president of the German tariff commission, and he is making a plea for the retention of the present duties. He employs three or four thousand hands in my district. This is one of the claims he makes why the present duty should be retained. This is one of the disabilities under which, he says, he labors:

The operatives in American woolen mills, in spite of the very much higher wages paid, are largely drawn from the ranks of unskilled labor. And whence does this unskilled labor come? There is little of it among native-born Americans. It is taken from the steady flow of immigration into this country.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Here we have the situation. This gentleman insists upon an ad valorem tariff duty upon the things he sells, to wit, worsted and woolen goods, but at the same time the thing that he buys is coming in free at every port in this country.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. HULL. Do not the statistics show that more than 60 per cent of the total mill employees in the country are foreigners?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. It is my recollection that more than 60 per cent of the employees throughout the country are of that character.

Mr. HULL. The very character of labor about which they complain in other countries.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I would like to go on, but I will yield.

Mr. DYER. The gentleman presents some tables in that statement, and I would like to ask him if he has examined them as to the wages paid in Germany and this country, and I would like to ask him, if he has examined them, to state whether or not they are correct.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I think they are not. I think they are substantially incorrect; but I examined them nevertheless. Now, I would just like to say this: Anybody who knows anything about the labor question knows that the real cause of high wages in any line of industry is close, compact organization.

You will find men in industries that are capable of being organized receiving high wages. You will find men in industries that under present conditions are incapable of being highly organized receiving low wages. One of the things that the American workingmen ask at the hands of Congress is an opportunity to organize. They ask that they be not selected especially for the operation of the horrible writs of injunction which are never invoked against anybody else in the manner in which they are invoked against them. Now, instead of passing high tariffs, for which the workingmen are not asking you, if you really wanted to favor the American workingman why did you not, when you were in power all these years, pass an effective anti-injunction law that would permit him to go on strike and enable him to get some of the benefits which you give the manufacturer with the understanding that he would give part of it back to his workingmen in the form of higher wages? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question which I believe is not considered by him irrelevant, and that is this—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. I would like to know if, in the opinion of the gentleman, any tariff legislation will appreciably benefit the condition of the wage earners in this country?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Does the gentleman mean tariff legislation now, or as a general proposition?

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. As a general proposition.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. As a general proposition, no. Why should the manufacturer be expected to share with his workingmen? If I were dying to-night and were leaving money for my wife and my children, intrusting it to somebody, I would try to put him under bond, even if he were my closest friend; and in the same way why should we turn over to the manufacturer the opportunity to plunder the American people on his mere say-so that he, without giving bond of any kind, will turn over part of the plunder to somebody else? [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Will the gentleman permit a word further just there, rather in the way of explanation?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. My view being that no tariff legislation, in view of modern industrial developments and conditions, will tend appreciably to solve the economic and industrial problems confronting the wage earners in this country. [Applause on the Democratic side.] In other words, I think the tariff is very largely a sham issue and a humbug, whether it is high tariff, low tariff, or no tariff, in so far as it involves the welfare of the American wage earner and the solution of the great issues that are really pressing upon the American people for solution. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. It might be possible for the American workingman to benefit from the tariff if he could effect a close and compact organization. For instance, if he could protect himself against immigration, if he had the genius to organize all the different branches of the different industries so that he himself could become a monopolist, so that he could say to the other monopolists, "When you are stealing from the people, steal enough for me and give it to me." [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] It might be possible for him then to benefit. But as it stands now, you give a monopoly to the manufacturer. You say: "We protect you from competition," and the 10 manufacturers, say, who were formerly operating independently, combine and raise the price and get the benefit, and simply refuse to carry out their compact and bargain. They go to the four ends of the earth to get cheap labor to enable them to evade the solemn obligations they entered into to pay part of their profits back in high wages to the American workmen. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. ALLEN. The gentleman has undoubtedly received letters, as a number of us have, to the effect that certain reductions in the duties or the tariff taxes mean the cutting of the wages of the employees in the manufacturing concerns?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes, sir.

Mr. ALLEN. Has the gentleman ever received a letter saying that it might reduce the dividends by a tenth of 1 per cent or cut the salary by 5 cents of an officer of the concern? [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I do not think that question needs any answer. It answers itself. It used to be the common practice in this country, at the close of a campaign, for the manufacturers to post notices in their mills to the effect that if the Democrats elected a President their employees need not come back to work on Wednesday morning after election day, the election taking place on Tuesday; and on two different occasions, as I remember, after they had elected a Republican President, within a week after the election, there were strikes against reduction of wages.

Mr. SIMS. On account of what?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Oh, on account of the fact that the election was over. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] They did not need them again for four long years, and by that time a high percentage of them would be replaced by workers from other lands and other climes. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, gentlemen, I cut out of the New York World a clipping sometime ago, when gentlemen were discussing generally the operations of the Steel Trust and when that organization was being lauded throughout the country on account of the way it treated its men. That clipping stated that at that time the steel strikers numbered 20,000 and were rapidly organizing. A reading of the body of the clipping shows that these men were

striking, for 15 cents an hour, for a 10-hour day, 6 days to constitute a week's work. Now, you know what the average ad valorem protection is upon steel. I sat in the Ways and Means Committee room when the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE] was chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and heard Mr. Miles, of Wisconsin, beg that committee to put his product upon the free list if they had to, in order that he might get free raw materials and extend his business to all the four quarters of the earth. He said that at that time not only had the Steel Trust control of the steel situation, not only had they control of the wages of the workmen, but that they had control of the manufacturers of this country; and he said: "Gentlemen, in the name of God, take the fingers of this Steel Trust from my throat, so that my children and my children's children may not be compelled to be their servants." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

As I recollect the figures—I do not pretend to state them accurately—he then said he was compelled to pay \$1.40 a hundred for steel billets laid down in Pittsburg, like those which the German manufacturer could buy laid down in Antwerp for \$1 a hundred. If that is not substantially correct, I trust the gentleman from New York will correct me. I do not pretend to quote the figures with absolute accuracy, but that is my recollection.

Mr. PAYNE. I recollect very well that when the proposition was made to put agricultural implements, which Mr. Miles made, upon the free list, he came around and objected most strenuously.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes; I know. I will say that the statement which I have made will not be found in the printed hearings. You will find, if you examine it, that Mr. Miles's statement, as contained in the printed hearings, does not contain any such statement as that which I have made upon the floor.

Mr. MANN. That could only be because Mr. Miles himself took it out.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Oh, certainly; I understand that.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Miles had the freest opportunity to revise his statement, and to put in anything that he wanted to, and to take out anything that he wanted to.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I understand that.

Mr. MANN. Was not that a sort of fraud upon the committee? I think we are agreed about Mr. Miles.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. With reference to the price of steel billets in Pittsburg and Germany, was the statement of Mr. Miles correctly quoted by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES]?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not recall his statement as to the exact difference.

Mr. GARNER. But there was a difference?

Mr. PAYNE. But I know that the committee made a very substantial cut.

Mr. GARNER. Was there a difference in favor of the steel billets in Germany as against the Pittsburg mills?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Oh, yes.

Mr. PAYNE. I can not recollect what Mr. Miles said about that.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I do not think the gentleman quite understands me.

Mr. PAYNE. As you will recollect, we had accurate information before the committee as to the cost of steel billets in this country and in Germany.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I did not intend to say, and I think the gentleman from Texas thought I said, that the Steel Trust was selling at one price in Pittsburg and at another price in Germany. That was not my statement. They may have been doing that, and I understand they were doing that very thing at that time; but the point I was trying to make was that the German manufacturer of steel laid down steel billets at Antwerp at \$1, and the Steel Trust laid down steel billets at Pittsburg at \$1.40, being enabled to charge that much more by reason of the tariff.

Now, why was that difference allowed? That 40 cents a hundred was given to the Steel Trust in order that it might pay living wages to American workmen and enable them to clothe and feed their families and bring them up according to American standards. That is what it was given to them for. Now, what did they do with it? We find 20,000 men on a strike so that they might get \$1.50 for 10 hours a day, and 6 days to constitute a week's work. We found afterwards in that great State of Pennsylvania, in this very strike, men were working as high as 17 hours a day and 7 days in a week. The Pittsburg Survey, which the gentleman from Wisconsin referred to, showed that

the conditions in the city of Pittsburg were such that the men's wages were based on the ability of a single man in lodgings to live, and that once a man was hampered by a single dependent, a wife or a child, he must begin to go down to the slough of despond, where he belongs who spends every day more than he can earn. That is the situation that the Pittsburg Survey found in the highly protected State of Pennsylvania.

If you want to be friendly to the American laborer, as I stated before, instead of passing high-tariff legislation, which he has not asked for, give him the legislation that he is clamoring for.

Mr. MANN. Why do you not do it? You have control of the House.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. But we have not control of the other body.

Mr. MANN. Why do you not do it now?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. This minute?

Mr. MANN. Yes; instead of tariff legislation, why do you not pass their bill?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. In order to relieve the mind of the gentleman from Illinois, and I know he is wrought up over it, I will say that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee [Mr. CLAYTON] has introduced a bill, and in the fullness of time I have no doubt it will be reported favorably to the House, which divides contumacious conduct into direct and indirect contempt of court, and strikes out of the hands of the employer of labor one of the weapons they have heretofore used for oppressing and plundering the men who work for them.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that there are thousands of bills introduced in the House.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. But this bill will be reported, and I have no doubt will pass.

Mr. CARLIN. Will the gentleman from Illinois vote for it when it comes before the House?

Mr. MANN. I will determine that question when it comes before the House.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I have no doubt that the gentleman from Illinois will knock out a comma here and a period there, and finally vote for the bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt it will take a grammarian to perfect it. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. I would rather have the scrutiny of the gentleman from Illinois than not because I am very anxious that it should be a good bill. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have been in the House some time, and I have got over referring to myself as a new Member. [Laughter.] I notice that when gentlemen on that side of the House are considering the trust question they are very much afraid that they are going to do something detrimental to the workingman, and when they are considering the workingman they are very much afraid they are going to hurt the trusts. [Laughter and applause.]

The American workingman, after all, only asks for a square deal. He asks that this country be kept abreast, as far as legislation is concerned, with other great nations of the world. It is enough to bring the blush of shame to the cheek of any man who is proud of this country to know that it is practically now a crime for an organization, the members of which are engaged in producing a product that may become the subject of interstate commerce, or are engaged in interstate commerce itself, to strike. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind—and I have been engaged in many injunction suits and have defended labor men against the charge of conspiracy—I say there is not the slightest doubt in my mind but that a strike of trainmen on a railroad engaged in interstate commerce is a violation of the Sherman antitrust law. That should not be. There is nobody on this side of the House, and I believe a very negligible number on either side, who does not think that that situation should be remedied.

In England, as soon as the first intimation was received that the courts intended to hold that an organization of labor, acting within the purposes of its organization, going upon a strike and doing anything lawful and peaceable to make the strike successful—as soon as Parliament found that the courts would decide that that might be unlawful, they immediately passed a bill distinguishing organizations of labor from all other organizations and making it lawful for them to do what it might be unlawful for other organizations to do. That is in England, where they do not pretend to have established a fiscal policy solely for the benefit of the laboring man.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Has the gentleman heard that the first labor injunction issued by a court in this country was based upon an English decision to cure and prevent the repetition of which the English statute was passed?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes; I am familiar with that. I am familiar with the fact also that this anti-injunction question, which is a burning issue—I do not know whether you gentlemen are all aware of it or not—which is a burning issue in this country, has been settled in England, and surely we ought to be able to keep fairly abreast of that nation. We are so fond of pointing to her, making her the background upon which to show up our own superiority in every way, that it seems to me we ought to make an honest effort at least to give the American workingman the same chance to fight for his life and the life of his little ones that England gives the English workingman. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In the Westmoreland mining district there is a strike on at the present time, and the first thing that mine operator did, as is usually done in all such cases, was to get control of the local criminal machinery—the local judge, whom we must not recall; the prosecuting attorney; the sheriff—all the machinery for the operation of the criminal law was seized at once. All of those officers, perhaps, were put in office by the manufacturer or the coal operator, and in Westmoreland we have that situation. We had these men down here before the Committee on Rules begging that an investigation be held.

Testimony was given to show that these men went on strike, and that immediately, in pursuance to the usual custom, an injunction was issued against them and they were forbidden to meet. When they did meet the sheriff's deputies, men sworn in by the sheriff and paid by the coal miners, shot them down, and 20 of those striking miners were killed during the year and a half that this strike has lasted. Why, you talk about Russia! Does any man here dare to say that that could happen in any civilized country in the world except this? And it could not happen here but for the one thing, as one of these men said in the hearings, that these are a lot of poor, ignorant foreigners, who were brought over to drive down the wages of the American workingmen; and they have no idea of their own rights, no influence, and receive little or no sympathy from the people in the surrounding community. Those things are the things that drive the wages down. That is the situation that prevents the American laboring man from getting his share of that which you so lavishly dispense to the manufacturer; and I hope we will do one of two things: I hope we will either shield the American laboring man from this influx of immigration to an extent that is practicable, because I am no extremist in that regard, or else that we will relieve him, on the other hand, from the oppressions of the monopolies which charge him extortionate prices for that which he must have.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I will say that I think this is a good bill. I think it is a step in the right direction. I am one of those who, if we had power, would not rush hastily into a reckless revision of tariff schedules. I do not know that I ever heard any other man in this House say that he was in favor of a schedule-by-schedule revision before I said so. Two years ago, speaking on the Payne law, I took that position—that schedule-by-schedule revision was the way to handle this tariff question—because I do not believe any party ever was elected or will be elected that is powerful enough to meet the combined interests that are represented in all these tariff schedules. You can see the fight that the Woolen Trust is able to put up now on this one.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. WEEKS. The gentleman from New Jersey has just stated that this is a step in the right direction. Can he inform the House what, in his opinion, will be the last step in this direction?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. No; it all depends upon circumstances.

Mr. WEEKS. How soon will the next step be taken?

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Oh, the gentleman is not asking his question in good faith?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes; I am.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Well, I do not know. I would advise the gentleman to consult a clairvoyant. [Laughter.] I am neither the prophet nor the son of a prophet.

Mr. WEEKS. I am doing the next best thing, consulting a Representative on the Democratic side of the House who is talking.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Oh, we have 226 men over here, and at least 225 bosses, so you will have to go elsewhere for your information.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman speaks of only one who is not a boss, and I am sure it is not the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Oh, I am a mild-mannered man, as the gentleman from Illinois knows.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentleman from Illinois does not like this bill, but then he did not like the Payne bill. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] In fact, from what I know of the gentleman from Illinois in matters of legislation, I have come to the conclusion he is rather hard to please. But, whether this bill is a good bill or a bad bill, one thing I do know, and that is that it is different from the Payne bill. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] And so far as I am concerned, and so far as the balance of my colleagues on this side of the aisle are concerned, we are satisfied to go to the country calm and confident in the assurance that it is vastly different from the Payne bill. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BROWN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 11019) and had directed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I submitted some observations on the resolution offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] this afternoon and I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I desire in my remarks to incorporate some statements in reference to the pensions of soldiers as conducted in that institution and a few other little statements of that kind, and I would like permission to extend them in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Friday, June 16, 1911, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 11654) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Gen. James Winchester, of Tennessee; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11655) for removing obstructions, etc., from Obed River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11656) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to prepare a roster of all the armies engaged* in the service of the United States in all its wars, except the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 11657) for increasing the efficiency of Army bands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 11658) to further regulate the admission to and transmission through the United States mails of certain publications; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TALCOTT of New York: A bill (H. R. 11659) to prohibit the use or production of acetylene on cars used in interstate transportation of passengers, and to provide for the enforcement thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 11660) to authorize the St. Louis-Kansas City Electric Railway Co. to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the town of Weldon Springs Landing, Mo.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 11661) to provide for the retirement of employees in the civil service; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. CLAYTON: A bill (H. R. 11662) to repeal an act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, approved July 1, 1898; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BORLAND: Resolution (H. Res. 209) directing the Committee on the District of Columbia to inquire into the enforcement of the acts of Congress requiring fire escapes and relating to the construction of buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLINE: Resolution (H. Res. 210) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings to have printing and binding done; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HEFLIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 119) authorizing the President to appoint Panama-Pacific International Exposition Commissioners; to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 11663) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Evenbeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 11664) granting a pension to Nancy Lay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11665) for the relief of Thomas S. Johnson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 11666) granting a pension to Cedonia Bridwell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DENT: A bill (H. R. 11667) for the relief of Lieut. Herbert Hayden; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 11668) granting a pension to Richard L. Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 11669) for the relief of Hans M. Branson; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11670) for the relief of Howard H. Ragan; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 11671) granting pay to Faver Cason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11672) granting a pension to Lewis K. Grigsby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11673) granting a pension to Margie E. Cardwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11674) granting a pension to A. C. Stafford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11675) granting a pension to George Stephens, sr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11676) granting a pension to John S. Draper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11677) granting a pension to Daniel Ladd; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11678) granting a pension to Andrew J. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11679) granting an increase of pension to Robert Morris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11680) granting an increase of pension to Robert F. Boles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11681) granting an increase of pension to John Reader; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11682) granting an increase of pension to John B. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11683) for the relief of Charles W. Hewgley; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11684) for the relief of William Strong; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11685) for the relief of Shadrick Garrett; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11686) for the relief of R. L. Thompson; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11687) for the relief of James W. Turner; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11688) for the relief of the heirs of Dillard McMillan, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11689) for the relief of the heirs of James M. Marchbanks; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11690) to remove the charge of desertion standing against J. T. Bandy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11691) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of the heirs of Josiah Anthony, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KORBLY: A bill (H. R. 11692) granting a pension to Wilson Zurmehly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11693) granting a pension to Toinette Blackwell Glover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11694) granting a pension to Joseph J. Lilly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11695) granting an increase of pension to Michael Shuppert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11696) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Vest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11697) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Hornaday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11698) granting an increase of pension to William I. Boyd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11699) granting an increase of pension to William H. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 11700) granting an increase of pension to David Finger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11701) granting an increase of pension to George White, jr.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11702) granting an increase of pension to Emma L. Counsell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 11703) granting a pension to Henry J. Hennigar, alias Edgar Swissberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REDFIELD: A bill (H. R. 11704) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of David Crowther; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REILLY: A bill (H. R. 11705) granting an increase of pension to George B. French; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada: A bill (H. R. 11706) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Le Pert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 11707) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Shipman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 11708) for the relief of Sarah J. Van Vliet; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11709) granting an increase of pension to Augustus E. Zeitler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 11710) granting an increase of pension to Noah H. Stout; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 11711) for the relief of Emma F. Coyle; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11712) for the relief of the heirs of Granville J. Sinkhorn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11713) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Rudolphus Minton; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 11714) granting an increase of pension to John J. Watters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11715) granting an increase of pension to William P. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A bill (H. R. 11716) for the relief of James Potter; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. AKIN of New York: Communication signed by Walter C. Lomezak and others, druggists, of Gloversville, N. Y., protesting against the passage of House bill 8887; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. AYRES: Communication from H. Planten & Son, of Brooklyn, N. Y., indorsing a resolution of the drug-trade section of the New York Board of Trade and Transportation, opposing the passage of House bill 8887; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of residents of the Bronx, in favor of the parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. Dyer: Paper in support of House bill 4829, granting a pension to Allen Barnes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOYD of Arkansas: Petition of numerous citizens of Arkansas, asking for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARNER: Petitions of Alex Pomerantz and O. J. Berman, of Seguin, Tex., asking for a reduction in the duty on raw and refined sugars; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: Petitions of W. J. Wolf and numerous other residents of New York City, praying for the repeal of the duty on lemons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Resolution of State Council of California, Junior Order of American Mechanics, advocating amendment of immigration laws, to restrict alien immigration, etc.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, resolution of board of supervisors, Calaveras County, Cal., favoring acquisition or control by the United States Government of the Big Tree Grove in Calaveras County, Cal.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAGUIRE of Nebraska: Petitions of citizens of Lincoln and Havelock, Nebr., requesting investigation of the legality of the arrest in the McNamara case; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Resolutions of the State Council of California, Junior Order United American Mechanics, requesting amendments to the present immigration laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, favoring negotiations between the United States and Great Britain of an unlimited arbitration convention, as proposed by President Taft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the chambers of commerce of San Francisco and Stockton, Cal., requesting the transfer of the sloop of war *Portsmouth* to San Francisco; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of numerous citizens of California, indorsing Mr. BERGER's resolution for an investigation of the arrest of McNamara and McManigal; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REILLY: Resolutions of the National Consumers' League at its annual meeting in Pittsburg, Pa., protesting against the employment of minors in the delivery of mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WHITE: Papers to accompany House bill 11609, granting an increase of pension to William Ross; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Resolutions of Milwaukee Clearing House Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to proposed legislation affecting cold-storage industries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions of National Consumers' League at its annual meeting in Pittsburg, Pa., protesting against the employment of minors in the delivery of mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, June 16, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Washington, D. C., favoring the consideration of the appropriation bills for the expenses of the District of Columbia by the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House, instead of by the District of Columbia Committees, which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a memorial of Keene Hill Grange, No. 1602, Patrons of Husbandry, of Ohio, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Washington, D. C., praying that the District of Columbia appropriation bill be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia for consideration instead of to the Committee on Appropriations, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CULLOM presented a memorial of Local Union No. 47, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, of Coulterville, Ill., remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of Retail Clerks' Union No. 219, of Belleville, Ill., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Club of La Grange, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation for the preservation and control of the waters of Niagara Falls, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Chicago Peace Society, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the ratification of the proposed treaty of arbitration between the United States and Great Britain, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by Group 8, Bankers' Association of Illinois, favoring the adoption of an amendment to the national-bank act permitting national banks to make loans on real estate, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of Progressive Grange, No. 308, Patrons of Husbandry, of Healdsburg, Cal., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the so-called cold-storage bill extending the time limit for the cold storage of articles of food, which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. BROWN presented a petition of sundry Indians residing on the Winnebago Indian Reservation, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation permitting the Winnebago Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. STEPHENSON. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (J. Res. 120, A) memorializing Congress to cause all dams owned by the United States and maintained in and across the Fox River to be equipped with fishways.

Whereas the public right of fishing in the Fox River between the cities of De Pere and Oshkosh, Wis., has been practically destroyed by the placing of dams unequipped with fishways in said river; and

Whereas the United States Government owns, controls, and maintains a number of such dams in and across said river: Therefore be it Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to cause all dams owned and controlled by the United States and maintained in and across the Fox River in Wisconsin to be equipped with adequate fishways for the free ascent and descent of fish; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the United States Senators and Congressmen from the State of Wisconsin and to the Chief Clerks of the two Houses of Congress.

C. A. INGRAM,
Speaker of the Assembly.
THOMAS MORRIS,
President of the Senate.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
F. M. WYLLIE,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented the petition of Capt. H. A. Hamilton and sundry other citizens of Whitewater, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation to further increase the efficiency of the Organized Militia, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry business men of Spooner, Wis., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation designed to prevent legitimate protective price agreements and restrictions, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the First Unitarian Society of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the establishment of an international court of arbitration, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRISTOW presented memorials of sundry citizens of Kansas, remonstrating against the proposed reciprocal trade agreement between the United States and Canada, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SHIVELY presented memorials of the congregations of the Seventh-day Adventists Churches of Minora, Noblesville, Middletown, North Vernon, Kennard, and Kokomo, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented a memorial of the congregation of the Seventh-day Adventist Church of Washburn, Me., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Aroostook County, Me., remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KERN presented memorials of the congregations of the Seventh-day Adventist Churches of Indianapolis, Elnora, Kennard, and North Vernon, all in the State of Indiana, remonstrating against the enforced observance of Sunday as a day of rest in the District of Columbia, which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. JONES, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 1078) to amend section 4 of an act entitled "An act for the preservation of the public peace and the protection of property within the District of Columbia," approved July 29, 1892, as to kiteflying, submitted an adverse report thereon (No. 71), which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

S. 1072. A bill to amend section 895 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 72); and

S. 1081. A bill to provide for punishment for larceny of public property from the workhouse and the reformatory of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 73).

He also, from the Committee on Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (S. 2775) to authorize the establishment of